DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 626	VT 019 934
TITLE	Strengthening Manpower Programs for Spanish-Speaking Americans. Report of the Department of Labor Study Group on Manpower Needs of Spanish-Speaking Americans.
INSTITUTION	Thompson, Lewin, and Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	10 Nov 71
NOTE	146p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Groups; Employment Opportunities; Employment Programs; *Job Training; Labor Education; Manpower Development; *Manpower Needs; *Spanish Americans; Surveys; Use Studies; *Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the findings and recommendations of a study conducted cooperatively by a management consulting firm and a team of Spanish-speaking manpower specialists. Basic issues explored were: (1) What are the manpower needs of Spanish-speaking Americans, (2) How are manpower programs meeting the needs at present, and (3) What action can be taken by the Department of Labor, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to strengthen the delivery of manpower services. Findings revealed that: (1) The proportion of Spanish-speaking enrollees in manpower programs is lower than that for other disadvantaged groups, (2) The manpower programs with the lowest rates of Spanish-speaking participation are the major manpower activities in terms of monetary allocations, number of trainees, and job skills training, (3) Results of participation are poor in terms of completion of training, earnings, job retention, and upgrading, (4) Monolinguals and other severely educationally disadvantaged are generally screened out, (5) Programs are not tailored to unique language and cultural needs, (6) Neither manpower programs nor employment centers have given priority to Spanish-speaking people as they have done to other minorities, and (7) Involvement of Spanish-speaking persons in the planning and administration of programs has been minimal. (SN)

ED 075626

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STRENGTHENING MANPOWER PROGRAMS
FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

- - - - - - - - - -

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR STUDY GROUP
ON MANPOWER NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

November 10, 1971

VT019934

Thompson, Lewin & Associates, Inc.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY

CHAPTER I. MANPOWER NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

- Introduction
- Population
- Where Are They?
- Ethnic In-Group Differences
- Income
- Labor Force Participation and Employment
- Occupational Status
- Education
- Language and Cultural Factors

CHAPTER II. AN ASSESSMENT OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

- Introduction
- How the Field Visits Were Carried Out
- Quality of the Data
- Basic Findings
- Program Data

CHAPTER III. RECOMMENDED ACTION PLAN

- Introduction
- Section A: Building Long-Run Capability to Serve the Spanish-speaking Effectively
    - -- Bilingual and Bicultural Programs
    - -- Research and Demonstration
    - -- Strategic Involvement of the Spanish-speaking

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

- Section B: Strengthening Mainstream Manpower Programs
- Implementation Plan

CHAPTER IV. MANPOWER PLANNING FOR COMMUNITIES

- Introduction
- Assessment of Current Planning
- Efforts Underway to Strengthen Planning
- Towards a Framework for Strategic Manpower Planning
- Data and Information Needed for Manpower Planning

STRENGTHENING MANPOWER PROGRAMS

FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

SUMMARY

The Department of Labor (DOL) Study Group on the Manpower Needs of Spanish-speaking Americans carried out a 90-day analysis of manpower programs to develop an Action Plan to improve the delivery of services to Mexican Americans (Chicanos), Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other persons of Spanish origin.

This study was carried out by the management consulting firm of Thompson, Lewin and Associates, Inc., under contract with the Manpower Administration, working in cooperation with a team of Spanish-speaking manpower specialists. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the study organized to address the basic issues specified in the contract:

1. What are the manpower needs of Spanish-speaking Americans?
2. How are manpower programs meeting the needs at present?
3. What action can be taken by DOL, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to strengthen the delivery of manpower services?

In highly summarized form, it was found that:

A. MANPOWER NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING MORE SEVERE THAN REST OF POPULATION--EQUIVALENT IN SEVERITY TO NEEDS OF NEGROES; LIMITED PROGRESS IN NARROWING THE OPPORTUNITY GAP.

The Spanish-speaking people experience poverty and denial of economic opportunity at a level little realized by the average American, or by the target groups with which manpower programs normally deal:

- Spanish-speaking Americans make up roughly 5 percent of the population, making them the second largest minority group -- about half the size of the Negro population

This report makes many comparisons between the characteristics of the Spanish-speaking people and other ethnic groups in American society. This is necessary because a central theme of the study contract is relative need and how it is being met, and ways it can be met more effectively. Many references highlight the relative status of the Spanish-speaking and Negroes. This recognizes the fact that the Department of Labor and other manpower agencies have made strenuous efforts in recent years to understand the needs of Negroes as the largest disadvantaged minority group and to accord higher priority to meeting those needs.

Attempts to clarify the much less widely recognized needs of the Spanish-speaking should not be misconstrued as efforts to minimize the importance of continued and expanded efforts to respond to the urgent problems of Negroes and other disadvantaged groups. On the contrary, the root of the difficulty is the scarcity of manpower resources that raises the spectre of minority and disadvantaged groups competing, largely in the political arena, for a piece of the action. This report proposes that the Department take steps to avoid that eventuality through more objective analytical approaches to measuring and quantifying relative need and basing the planning and management of manpower programs on these need indices.

As discussed later (under the concept of parity) this would enable the Department over time to make more equitable *allocation of existing resources between various ethnic groups (through a graduated strategy of using new resources at the margin, without "taking anything away" from groups or individuals now being served). This would also develop a valid body of data and program experience that would enable the Department to defend to the Congress a budget request for resources adequate to serve all disadvantaged persons.*

- In contrast with the widely held view that most Spanish-speaking are migrants or live on farms, 80 percent reside in urban areas, 46 cities throughout the country have target populations over 10,000 (Chapter I, Table II)

- The largest and most impoverished Spanish-speaking groups are Mexican Americans (55 percent) and Puerto Ricans (16 percent); Cubans, Central and South Americans, and other persons of Spanish origin tend to be better educated and to have relatively higher incomes (I-5,6)

- 24.3 percent of Spanish-speaking persons are living in poverty, compared with 12.6 percent of all Americans (I-7)

- Unemployment is high -- 10.1 percent for Mexican Americans and 10.0 percent for Puerto Rican males, compared with 8.6 percent for all males of Spanish origin; 9.1 percent for Negro males; and 6.0 percent for the total population (I-8)

- The Spanish-speaking, like Negroes, are concentrated in lower paying occupations; only 23.2 percent of Spanish-speaking are in white collar jobs, as compared with 22 percent of Negroes and 42 percent of the total population (I-9)

- Lowest level of educational attainment of any Americans - 19.5 percent of the Spanish-speaking 25 years old and over have completed less than 5 years of school (25.7 percent of Mexican Americans and 23.7 percent of Puerto Ricans), as compared with 13.5 percent of Negroes and 5 percent of the total population; only 34 percent of Spanish-speaking in the same age group have completed 4 years of high school or more, as compared with 34.7 percent of Negroes and 56.4 percent of the total population (I-9)

- Language barriers are severe with one adult in four illiterate in English and perhaps one in ten unable to speak the language necessary for economic viability (I-13)

- Major obstacles are posed by cultural characteristics and a differing value orientation of Spanish-speaking persons due to the lack of understanding of the larger society coupled with a partially self-imposed ethnic isolation of the group itself (I-14)

- La raza, pride in a unique ethnic heritage of Spanish-speaking peoples, has yet to be creatively linked with the economic promise of our society in ways that enrich the cultural heritage of all Americans (I-14)

B. MANPOWER PROGRAMS FALL SHORT OF THE NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

Manpower programs to date have not provided sufficient services to the Spanish-speaking population relative to their needs and to the services provided other groups. This is the conclusion that emerges from an analysis of DOL program reports and data, field visits to 20 communities of high target group concentration, and other available information.

The basic findings revealed that:

- The proportion of Spanish-speaking enrollees in manpower programs is lower than that for other disadvantaged groups (e.g., MDTA/OJT which is the program with the poorest participation record shows 8 percent for Spanish-speaking, 29 percent for whites, and 65 percent for Negroes; NAB/JOBS which involves the largest number of Spanish-speaking records their participation as 13 percent, compared with 69 percent Negroes and 24 percent whites) (II-20)

- Those manpower programs with the lowest rates of Spanish-speaking participation (MDTA/Institutional and OJT, NAB/JOBS, Job Corps) are the major manpower activities in terms of dollars, number of trainees and opportunities for upgrading skills. Programs with a relatively better participation ratio (NYC, New Careers and Operation Mainstream) included few persons in other than work support programs that offer limited opportunities for long-term economic advancement. Despite increases in Spanish-speaking enrollment in recent years, participation levels remain proportionately low (II-20)

- Results of participation are poor in terms of completion of training, earnings, job retention and upgrading (II-14)

- Monolinguals and other severely educationally disadvantaged are generally "screened out" (II-14)

- Programs are not tailored to unique language and cultural needs (II-5)

- Manpower programs have not given priority to the Spanish-speaking people as has been done with some other disadvantaged groups (e.g. Negroes) (II-16)

- Efforts of the Employment Service in recent years to give greater priority to the disadvantaged has brought comparatively few benefits to Spanish-speaking persons. Only 7.1 percent of those placed in nonagricultural jobs during the first six months of FY 1971 were of Spanish origin while 36 percent of those placed were Negroes, whereas they comprise 5 and 11 percent of the population respectively (II-21)

- Involvement of Spanish-speaking persons and groups in the planning and administration of manpower programs has been minimal

- Apart from a very few larger projects like Operation SER (Service, Employment Redevelopment - a manpower program in five Southwestern States administered by Mexican Americans) and migrant projects - program efforts underway reflect limited budget obligations; impact on few participants; and generally represent small scale experiments or the selection, as in Job Corps or CEP (Concentrated Employment Program), of a handful of sites to serve persons of Spanish origin. Some of these programs show promise, but they do not add up to a meaningful system of services.

Except where otherwise indicated, all data on program participation were provided by the Manpower Administration's Office of Management and Manpower Data Systems. Despite their noteworthy efforts to respond to the special data needs of this study within the time available, it was not possible to reconcile all the technical data discrepancies.

This results from the fact that the Department's information system is not organized to produce, on a periodic basis, data that lends itself to comparisons with other ethnic groups in terms of program participation, characteristics, and results. Data on Spanish-speaking Americans *is commingled with Anglo whites and, to a slight extent, with Negroes. Consequently, percentage arrays do not always add to 100. While data used in the report have been adjusted to minimize this factor and to present valid comparisons, they should be regarded as approximations subject to later refinement. These technical adjustments are unlikely to alter the basic picture presented here.*

Some of the underlying reasons for the above situation are:

- Neither the Congress, the President, nor Federal agencies have enunciated the principle of parity or fair share in targeting manpower services on disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities, with the result that program administrators have left out the Spanish-speaking.

  Parity as defined here means that each segment of the target community served by the program should receive a fair share of program services -- including results achieved -- equivalent to its proportion of the target population and taking into account relative need. An approach to the development of a parity formula is outlined in the report.

- Despite limited Federal authority over manpower planning and execution at the community level, and an apparent trend toward decentralization, DOL policies and actions exert a significant influence over state and local officials. The thrust of Federal emphasis, however, is interpreted as a preoccupation with guidelines and the mechanics of individual program operations, rather than a results-oriented focus on the combined impact of manpower and related programs on communities and on the life chances of individuals.

- Manpower program administrators cannot provide leadership in meeting the job needs of the Spanish-speaking to overcome the barriers of poverty, discrimination, and language and cultural differences without the active involvement of educators and other social service deliverers. Bilingual and bicultural manpower-education programs and framework for coordinated action do not now exist except in limited demonstration settings.

- Despite some progress over the last decade in breaking down discrimination and barriers to employment in the public and private sectors, Spanish-speaking Americans remain effectively excluded from all but menial, entry-level jobs. Often even these are not available. There is no coordinated program of cooperation between DOL, the other Federal agencies with major responsibilities in this area, and the business community and unions.

- A relatively passive DOL strategy in the implementation of manpower programs for the Spanish-speaking has led to a lack of clear direction to Regional Offices, the Employment Service and manpower administrators generally. This results in a confused pattern of resource allocation choices between meeting the employer's need for a skilled labor force at the lowest cost vs. serving the employability needs of the disadvantaged. It also manifests itself in a lack of training and technical assistance and an absence of efforts to develop Spanish-speaking leadership and institutions that could facilitate more responsive delivery of services.

- In the final analysis, and as indicated in the Manpower Report to the President, the standard by which manpower programs and institutions must be judged is the extent to which they are enhancing the employability and job placement of workers, particularly the disadvantaged, and directly contributing to their productivity, career upgrading, and ability to adapt to the changing demands of a dynamic economy. Significant progress can be made against this standard for Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and others of Spanish origin.

C. DOL LEADERSHIP AND ACTION COULD OPEN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

Major DOL policy decisions will be necessary to insure parity or fair share for persons of Spanish origin and to set in motion forces that will, over time, narrow the opportunity gap. A cohesive manpower strategy should be set forth, responsive to the group's unique language and cultural characteristics. Successful implementation of this strategy will require that DOL redouble its leadership efforts with regard to other Federal agencies, State and local government, and the private sector in forging an improved and more relevant network of program linkages.

The proposed strategy is laid out in an Action Plan with two parallel thrusts. The first part addresses the question of how to develop a long-run capability within the Department and its programs to perpetuate improvements in services to the Spanish-speaking -- improvements which have already been initiated by the Manpower Administration, and further improvements proposed in this report. Specifically, the Department is urged to:

- Work with other Federal agencies to design a bilingual-bicultural program linking manpower and education

- Mount a special Research and Demonstration Plan for the Spanish-speaking

- Increase funding support to manpower programs focusing on the needs of the Spanish-speaking and take related action, such as increased training and technical assistance

- Develop Spanish-speaking leadership in manpower through special executive recruitment and development programs, including increasing the present numbers of Spanish-speaking in super grades from the present 18 by adding 50 over the next two years (in part through systematic efforts to upgrade GS-14/15s)

The second part of the Action Plan is an integral feature of the overall strategy contemplated in the first. In it are recommendations for strengthening mainstream manpower programs toward optimum effectiveness for the Spanish-speaking. Specifically, it is recommended that the Department:

- Develop a statement of manpower policy and goals for persons of Spanish origin, building on the principle of parity for all disadvantaged groups irrespective of ethnic origin as a basis for resource allocation and program participation and design

- Issue guidance and provide other assistance in carrying out strategic manpower planning at State and local levels on behalf of the Spanish-speaking population (a special chapter of the report provides an outlined detailed statement of such guidance)

13

- Redesign manpower reports, information systems, and census strategies, to provide the necessary manpower data to "keep score" for the Spanish-speaking as is now done for whites and Negroes

- Develop a plan to broaden public sector employment for the Spanish-speaking to at least their proportion of the population within five years (1970 Federal employment was 2.9 percent, and increased only .1 percentage point over the prior year)

- Initiate a joint program with EEOC to eliminate discrimination through a strategy emphasizing "class actions" and attacking personnel, testing and other systems that foster inequity in the Spanish-speaking obtaining jobs

- Mount a cooperative program with the National Alliance of Businessmen (outlined in detail in the report) to open job opportunities

- Seek the support of the AFL/CIO in broadening union participation (2.5 million minority union members -- 6.7 percent of unionized workers are Spanish-speaking and 9.2 percent are Negroes)

- Mount other program activities (described in the report) affecting these Spanish-speaking groups:
  -- Women
  -- Youth
  -- Veterans
  -- Migrants
  -- Border Crossers

- Initiate a priority effort to move Spanish-speaking Americans off welfare and into jobs through studies and other actions related to the Opportunities for Families Program

Finally, the Department is urged to take the necessary implementation steps to insure priority review and follow-up action on these recommendations by assigning implementation responsibility at a high level in the Department with adequate staff support earmarked for the time required. A detailed Implementation Plan accompanies the Action Plan.

CHAPTER I

MANPOWER NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

INTRODUCTION

This report sets forth the basic rationale for the Action Plan and recommendations in four steps:

- Analyze manpower needs (Chapter I)
- Assess program services being delivered in the light of those needs (Chapter II)
- Determine actions that could be taken to make manpower programs more responsive and effective (Chapter III)
- Identify elements of a community planning system (Chapter IV)

The manpower needs of the Spanish-speaking people fall into two categories: those they share in common with other moniority groups that experience poverty, lack of education, discrimination and exclusion from economic opportunity; and those unique handicaps resulting from language barriers and cultural characteristics.

In general, Spanish-speaking Americans are severaly disadvantaged relative to the Anglo population and in roughly the same status as Negroes when compared with such indicators as income, occupational status, and unemployment. Educational attainment of the Spanish-speaking population is substantially lower than Anglos, Negroes or any other group in the society. Discrimination, while apparently not as severe as that directed against Negroes, remains a major obstacle, particularly for Chicanos and Puerto Ricans who are poor.

Lack of facility in English is a major handicap for over half the group, with one adult in four unable to read and write the language in which business and government affairs are conducted in this country.* Other cultural differences, including a partially self-imposed ethnic isolation common to earlier generations of immigrants, leaves a great many Spanish-speaking Americans outside the mainstream of economic opportunity.

---

*Bureau of Census; Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: November 1969.

Manpower programs should be based on an in-depth analysis of the needs of the group to be served, taking into account the relative needs of other groups. No such analysis has been carried out for Spanish-speaking Americans by DOL or any other agency. At the state and local level, only a few areas have attempted even a cursory analysis. The basic data are not available, or not organized in a way that lends itself to treating the Spanish-speaking population as a group.* Only recently have Federal policy makers begun to view the issue in these terms. This chapter attempts to summarize what is known.

POPULATION

A basic ingredient of an assessment of the characteristics and manpower needs of the Spanish-speaking people, as with any other group, is accurate and up to date demographic information. There is considerable controversy over the actual numbers of Spanish-speaking people in the United States. Informal estimates of some spokesmen range upwards of 16 million. A more conservative figure of 11.9 million includes the 9.2 million in the 1969 sample census for the 50 states and the District of Columbia plus 2.7 million in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Spanish-speaking Americans comprise over 5 percent of the U.S. population, making them the second largest minority after the Negroes who make up 11 percent.

Some evidence suggests that this may understate the true total U.S. count substantially; however, it is only possible to document this in isolated instances based on information from local census studies, migrant studies, public school information, the Cuban resettlement program, and the like.

---

*The 1969 sample census is an exception: Bureau of Census; Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: November 1969.

Such data have no statistical reliability on a national basis, although it is useful for state and local manpower planning. For national estimates, the 1969 census is the most reliable data currently available*. Results of the 1970 census, unfortunately also a sample, will not be available until late 1971.

Apart from substantial increase in numbers, two factors have marked the Spanish-speaking population in the years since World War II: urbanization and dispersion throughout the country. Over 80 percent of the Spanish-speaking are in urban areas. There are 46 cities with high population concentrations (10,000 or more). Although 61 percent of the Spanish-speaking are in five Southwestern States, there has been extensive population dispersion in recent years. 23 States have population concentrations sufficient to require priority emphasis in manpower planning. There is little public awareness of these basic demographic factors and only limited and unsystematic efforts on the part of program administrators to target program services in response to them. Spanish-speaking leaders themselves are only recently beginning to see the need to adopt a national perspective.

WHERE ARE THEY?

DOL and other Federal program efforts, apart from those designed to benefit migrants, have been directed almost exclusively in three priority areas:

- The Southwestern States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas. The overwhelming majority of the 5.1 million Mexican Americans and 3 out of 5 Spanish-speaking Americans still reside in that area.

---

*See Statement of Dr. George H. Brown, Director, Bureau of the Census, Before the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Washington, D. C., June 10, 1971, for his assessment of the margin of error in such sampling and the impossibility of using the Current Population Survey, as currently stratified, to obtain reliable data on the Spanish-speaking population.

TABLE I. Spanish-Speaking American Population for Selected States*

		(In thousands)
1.	California	3000
2.	Texas	2000
3.	New York	1500
4.	Illinois	400
5.	Florida	389
6.	New Mexico	325
7.	Arizona	250
8.	Colorado	250
9.	New Jersey	150
10.	Michigan	115
11.	Ohio	52
12.	Oregon	50
13.	Utah	45
14.	Maryland	45
15.	Pennsylvania	40
16.	Kansas	38
17.	Indiana	35
18.	Massachusetts	30
19.	Connecticut	25
20.	Nebraska	22
21.	Missouri	20
22.	Wisconsin	21
23.	Washington	18

---

*Compiled by MA staff, based on 1960 Census or later population estimates.

TABLE II. Spanish-Speaking American Population for Communities with Over 10,000 Target Residents

(In thousands)

Region	Community*	Population**	Principal Group***
I	Boston	18	PR
	Springfield	15	PR
	Bridgeport	20	PR
	Hartford	15	PR
II	Newark	35	PR
	Paterson	25	PR
	Hoboken	15	PR
	Jersey City	15	PR
	Perth Amboy	12	PR
	New York City	1300	PR
	Rochester	12	PR
	Buffalo	10	PR
III	Philadelphia	55	PR
IV	Miami	379	C
V	Chicago	280	MA/PR/C
	Gary	22	MA
	Cleveland	18	PR
	Loraine	12	MA
	Milwaukee	17	MA
	Detroit	34	MA/PR
	Lansing	10	MA

---

*The community designated may be an SMSA, city or county depending on available data

**Compiled by MA staff, based on 1960 Census or later population estimates if available

***Indicates whether principal group is Mexican American (MA), Puerto Rican (PR) or Cuban (C)

TABLE II. (cont.)

Region	Community	Population	Principal Group
VI	San Antonio	257	MA
	El Paso	137	MA
	Brownsville	97	MA
	Houston	63	MA
	Corpus Christi	60	MA
	Laredo	52	MA
	Austin	26	MA
	Albuquerque	68	MA
	Santa Fe	24	MA
	Los Cruces	10	MA
	New Orleans	32	C
VII	Kansas City, Missouri	15	MA
VIII	Denver	43	MA
	Pueblo	25	MA
IX	Fresno	61	MA
	Los Angeles (including East Los Angeles)	577	MA
	San Francisco	52	MA
	San Jose	78	MA
	San Diego	65	MA
	Oakland	24	MA
	San Bernadino	16	MA
	Santa Ana	15	MA
	Stockton	31	MA
	Phoenix	80	MA
	Tuscon	34	MA

- New York City where 8 out of 10 of the 1.5 million Puerto Ricans in the 50 states reside.
- Florida where large numbers of the 600,000 persons of Cuban, and Central or South American origin have settled.

This covers the major areas where the population still resides, however, it leaves over 1.7 million persons outside these priority target areas (not to imply that all or even a substantial number of those in the target areas are benefiting from services -- an issue which is explored in Chapter II.)

It would be highly useful for DOL to develop an official list of areas of high concentration of Spanish-speaking population to use in program planning and priority allocation decisions and to direct program administrators consciously to locate at least some program activities in these areas and to insure that the Spanish-speaking target groups needs are met. To this end information on states and communities listed in Tables I and II is included based on the best population estimates available.

Note that this includes such states in the top ten of Spanish-speaking population concentration as Illinois (fourth), New Jersey (ninth), and Michigan (tenth), which are seldom considered in connection with this issue. Similarly Chicago, with 280,000 Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and Cubans has the fifth highest concentration of Spanish-speaking persons of any city in the country -- just ahead of San Antonio -- but there has been no apparent recognition of this fact.

ETHNIC IN-GROUP DIFFERENCES

This report, in part by virtue of the limitations of available data, generally deals with the Spanish-speaking community as a whole. While this is justified somewhat by a new-found sense of group identity around a common language and set of cultural values symbolized in the concept of La raza, it does violence to important differences within this ethnic group.

Some differences remain subjective and are felt most keenly by those within the ethnic group themselves. They are not readily analyzed by outsiders, such as a preference for self-identification with a Spanish rather than Mexican heritage. Some distinctions have little direct relevance for manpower programs and can be overlooked, others are pivotal. What follows is a brief and highly simplified overview.

1. Mexican Americans.* This is the largest subgroup, making up 55 percent of persons of Spanish origin (according to a March 1971 census sample), with the majority born in the U.S. and residing in the Southwest. Large numbers experience poverty, low education, etc. Except for some areas like New Mexico and a few places in California and Texas, they have not reached positions of economic power or political influence.

---

*There is lingering controversy over the designation of this group with many persons preferring "Spanish American", "Hispano", "Spanish-surnamed American", "Spanish-speaking", "Latin American", "Chicano", or even "Mexican". Undoubtedly, many of the 1.6 million persons of "other Spanish origin" in the 1969 census did not feel comfortable with this designation, although many of them reside in the Southwest. The terms Mexican American and Chicano are used in this report, with apologies to those who would prefer other terms, because they have won growing acceptance by the group itself.

The term Spanish-speaking Americans used throughout the report is fraught with similar difficulties, but it appears to have much broader acceptance than "Spanish Americans" which is the standard label in DOL reports. It reflects a sense of shared cultural identity based largely on language, notwithstanding the fact that increasing numbers of the younger members of the group may not actually speak Spanish.

2. Puerto Ricans. This is the second largest identifiable group, comprising almost 17 percent (according to the same survey). Over half have arrived in recent years from Puerto Rico. The group resides primarily in the Northeastern United States, especially New York City. By most measures of income, unemployment, education, etc., they are the most severely disadvantaged Spanish-speaking (however, the condition of Mexican Americans in some communities, and migrants generally, is as bad or worse). Puerto Ricans have attained little economic or political leverage.

3. Cubans. The 565,000 Cubans are almost entirely foreign born, entering this country in the last few years and residing to a large extent in the Miami area. A large segment of the Cuban population came to this country already possessing job skills and a profession. They have made the adjustment relatively easily, thanks in part to the excellent Cuban Resettlement Program. On the whole they are better educated, earn higher incomes, and hold better jobs than Chicanos or Puerto Ricans.

4. Central and South Americans and Other Persons of Spanish Origin. This is a large and diverse group, making up 23 percent of the Spanish-speaking population. Most were born in the U.S. and about half reside in the Southwest. They tend to represent a relative economic and social elite, with higher incomes, better jobs, and more education than other Spanish-speaking groups, even Cubans.

For the most part, the analysis in this report has focused on Chicanos and Puerto Ricans. Except where otherwise stipulated, however, it is believed that the findings and recommendations also hold true for disadvantaged Cubans, Central and South Americans and others of Spanish origin.

INCOME

Income is the best single determinant of economic and social status. Median family income in 1969 was $5,641 for the Spanish-speaking and $8,011 for all Americans. In 1970 those figures rose to $7,334 and $9,867 respectively.* Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans fared worse than the overall Spanish-speaking median: Mexican American median family income was $7,117 in 1970; for Puerto Ricans in the U.S. it was $5,975 ($300 less than the median for Negroes).

According to the same report, 24.3 percent of the Spanish-speaking are living in poverty, when incomes are adjusted to take into account such factors as family size, sex and age of family head, number of children and farm-nonfarm residence. Of that 24 percent, or 2.2 million people, however, 87 percent are Mexican American or Puerto Rican. For those two subgroups, the percentages of persons living in poverty were 28 and 29.2 respectively. For all Americans the comparable figure, as shown in Table III, is 12.6 percent; for Negroes it is 33.6 percent. Clearly, the Spanish-speaking, and particularly Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, are congregated along with Negroes at the bottom of the economic ladder -- in terms of income.

---

*Bureau of the Census; Selected Characteristics of Persons and Families of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Other Spanish Origin: March 1971. This data, made public in October 1971, was used in a revision and updating of our report carried out at the request of the Manpower Administration. The original draft of the report was based on the best data available during the period of the contract study, including the November 1969 sample census, which is still cited in this report for population estimates. Except where otherwise noted, characteristics data related to the needs of the Spanish-speaking population are based on this March 1971 sample census of 50,000 households.

TABLE III. Persons Below the Low-Income Level in 1970[*]

Ethnic Origin	Percent in Poverty
All Americans	12.6
Whites	9.9
Spanish Origin	24.3
Mexican	28.0
Puerto Rican	29.2
Cuban	13.7
Other	14.0
Negroes	33.6

---

[*] Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 224, October 1971.

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The labor force participation of the Spanish-speaking population has traditionally been relatively low, compared with Anglos, and about the same as Negroes. Spanish-speaking females have been in the labor force significantly less than other women.

A slightly different picture emerges in the 1971 census, however, with participation rates for men closer to those for whites than those for Negroes. The figures are summarized in Table IV; Spanish-speaking females still participate significantly less than women of other races or ethnic origins.

The unemployment rate for Spanish-speaking men was 8.6 percent as of March, 1971, compared with 6.0 percent for all American men and 9.1 percent for Negro men. The unemployment rates for Mexican American and Puerto Rican men both exceeded the rate for Negroes during the reporting period: they were 10.1 percent and 10.0 percent respectively. As may be seen in Table V, the unemployment rates for Spanish-speaking women were generally lower than for Blacks; the group with the highest unemployment rate reported was Puerto Rican male youths (16-24 years old) -- of whom more than one in four was actively seeking employment.

TABLE IV. Labor Force Participation of Persons 16 to 64 Years Old, by Age, Sex and Ethnic Origin: March 1971*

(Noninstitutional Population)

Age and Sex	Total Population			Spanish Origin		
	All Races[1]	White[2]	Negro and other races	Total[3]	Mexican	Puerto Rican
MALE						
Total, 16 to 64 years old	86.4	87.1	80.6	85.4	85.4	78.2
16 to 24 years old	68.6	69.4	63.3	67.9	66.1	68.5
25 to 44 years old	96.3	96.8	92.5	94.1	95.6	85.0
45 to 64 years old	89.3	90.0	83.5	88.2	88.5	(B)
FEMALE						
Total, 16 to 64 years old	49.0	48.5	53.0	39.4	36.4	29.1
16 to 24 years old	48.7	49.6	42.6	36.0	35.5	34.2
25 to 44 years old	48.8	47.1	60.9	40.8	38.0	22.3
45 to 64 years old	49.5	49.2	52.2	40.7	34.3	38.3

[B] Base less than 75,000.

[1] Includes persons of "other races", not shown separately

[2] Includes almost all persons reporting Spanish origin. About 97 percent of persons of Spanish origin, about 99 percent of persons of Mexican origin, and 96 percent of persons of Puerto Rican origin were classified white in this survey.

[3] Includes persons of Central or South American, Cuban, and other Spanish origin, not shown separately.

*Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 224, October 1971.

TABLE V. Unemployment Rates for Persons 16 to 64 Years Old, by Age, Sex, and Ethnic Origin: March 1971*

(Civilian noninstitutional population)

Age and Sex	Total Population			Spanish origin		
	All Races	White	Negro and other races	Total	Mexican	Puerto Rican
TOTAL, 16 to 64 years old	6.0	5.6	9.1	8.6	10.1	10.0
16 to 24 years old	13.6	12.7	20.1	15.2	14.3	25.4
25 to 44 years old	4.4	4.2	5.9	6.3	7.1	5.0
45 to 64 years old	3.9	3.9	5.5	8.0	12.2	N/A
TOTAL, 16 to 64 years old	7.0	6.5	10.4	9.2	10.1	10.6
16 to 24 years old	12.5	11.2	22.4	14.4	15.5	N/A
25 to 44 years old	6.1	5.8	7.9	8.4	8.9	N/A
45 to 64 years old	3.9	3.8	4.6	4.9	5.3	N/A

*Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 224, October 1971.

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Spanish-speaking workers tend to be concentrated in lower paying occupations. As with Negroes, about 7 out of 10 Spanish-speaking persons are in unskilled and low-paid blue-collar, service and farm jobs. Only 23.2 percent of males of Spanish origin hold white-collar jobs, compared with 41.7 percent of the rest of the population (figures for white collar females are 41 and 61 percent, respectively). Again, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans (71 percent of the continental U.S. Spanish-speaking population) each benefit less than the average for all Spanish-speaking. While the overall average participation in white collar jobs is 23.2 percent, the figure for Mexican Americans is 18.2 percent; for Puerto Ricans it is 19.8 percent.

Spanish-speaking Americans have not shared in the development of leadership that has moved increasing numbers of other minority groups, including Negroes, into professional managerial and technical jobs. Not only have Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking persons attained few key positions in government mainstream occupations and the private sector, they have even failed to establish a beachhead in poverty-, manpower- and other social-program agencies that have proliferated over the last decade. Undoubtedly, in large part, this is a consequence of the educational gap as well as discriminatory barriers which are shared with other minorities.

EDUCATION

Persons of Spanish origin have a lower level of educational attainment than any other group in the population. One of every five persons of Spanish origin (25 years old and over) has completed less than five years of school, as compared with one in twenty-five for all whites. The situation is worse for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans;

less than one in four Mexican Americans in that age group has completed five years of school, and only 23.7 percent of Puerto Ricans have done so. Of Spanish-speaking persons 25-29 years of age, about 48 percent completed high school; 58 percent of Negroes in that age group are high school graduates, as are 80 percent of all whites. While the average percents of high school completions by Spanish-speaking are far below Negroes and all whites for nearly every age group, Puerto Ricans experience a much lower rate than other Spanish-speaking subgroups. The statistics are summarized in Table VI.

According to November, 1969 Census figures, median years of school completed for Spanish-speaking Americans 35 years old or older was 8.5 years compared with 12.0 years for the rest of the population. Spanish-speaking persons 25 years old and over had completed 9.3 median school years. Among those 25 to 34 years old (a priority population for manpower programs), the median was 11.7 and the respective levels for ethnic subgroups were: Mexican American, 10.8; Puerto Rican, 9.9; and Cuban and others, 12.4.

It is important to recognize the wide disparity of educational standards in different communities. Table VII shows the comparative schooling of Mexican Americans and other groups for five Southern states according to 1960 census data. At that time median levels ranged from a low of 4.8 years in Texas to 8.6 years in California. Such data do not, of course, reflect differences in the quality of education - they equate four years in say Laredo with four years of schooling in Los Angeles, which are not necessarily comparable.

These data also suggest some gradual narrowing of the educational gap, at least compared with Anglos, and, an increase in years of schooling over time. From 1950 to 1960, Mexican Americans increased their median schooling by 1.7 years; and from 1960 to 1969 further increased the educational attainment, particularly for younger persons.

TABLE VI. Percent of the Population 25 Years Old and Over Who Had Completed Less than 5 Years of School or 4 Years of High School or More, by Ethnic Origin: March 1971*

Years of School Completed and Age	Total Population			Spanish Origin		
	All Races	White	Negro	Total	Mexican	Puerto Rican
PERCENT COMPLETED LESS THAN 5 YEARS OF SCHOOL						
Total, 25 years old and over	5.0	4.1	13.5	19.5	25.7	23.7
25 to 29 years old	1.1	1.1	1.8	5.8	6.6	9.3
30 to 34 years old	1.4	1.3	2.3	9.6	10.2	15.1
35 to 44 years old	2.6	2.3	5.4	18.1	25.5	20.3
45 to 54 years old	3.6	2.7	11.8	20.4	27.8	23.6
55 to 64 years old	5.9	4.3	22.3	38.1	54.6	49.0
65 years old and over	13.4	11.1	40.8	47.3	63.2	61.0
PERCENT COMPLETED 4 YEARS HIGH SCHOOL OR MORE						
Total, 25 years old and over	56.4	58.6	34.7	32.6	26.3	19.8
25 to 29 years old	77.2	79.5	57.5	48.4	48.5	32.5
30 to 34 years old	72.9	75.1	53.8	41.8	41.4	21.8
35 to 44 years old	66.2	69.0	41.3	34.0	23.9	18.7
45 to 54 years old	58.7	61.7	29.1	24.5	14.9	16.3
55 to 64 years old	45.2	47.8	17.4	16.3	4.6	N/A
65 years old and over	29.3	30.8	11.3	15.1	6.7	N/A

*Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 224, October 1971.

TABLE VII. Median Years of Schooling Completed by Spanish Surnamed Persons Age 25 and Over Compared with Other Persons.

STATE AND POPULATION GROUP	MEDIAN YEARS COMPLETED 1960
Southwest	12.1
Anglo	12.1
Spanish-surname	7.1
Nonwhite	9.0
Arizona	
Anglo	12.1
Spanish-surname	7.0
Nonwhite	7.0
California	
Anglo	12.2
Spanish-surname	8.6
Nonwhite	10.6
Colorado	
Anglo	12.2
Spanish-surname	8.2
Nonwhite	11.2
New Mexico	
Anglo	12.2
Spanish-surname	7.4
Nonwhite	7.1
Texas	
Anglo	11.5
Spanish-surname	4.8
Nonwhite	8.1

Source: Adapted from a table in Grebler et al, op. cit., p. 150. Nonwhite figures include Negroes, American Indians, Japanese and Chinese. Based on 1960 Census.

Puerto Ricans have made somewhat less progress in narrowing the education gap over the last decade, possibly as a result of the recent influx from Puerto Rico.

In the face of these statistics, it is not surprising that manpower programs have been criticized for "creaming" in failing to select severely educationally disadvantaged Spanish-speaking enrollees. Existing MDTA guidelines and funding practices tend to perpetuate this situation.

The educational picture is even more serious at the level of higher education. Discriminatory barriers and limited means to finance advanced education have meant that only a handful of those who graduated from high school entered college, and still fewer received degrees. There were no ethnic institutions - comparable to the Negro colleges - to fill this gap, however inadequately, and to foster a tradition of higher learning and to serve as a training group for educators sensitive to the educational needs of the group. These factors have led to very small numbers of Spanish-speaking teachers, and a minute group of educational administrators in comparison with Anglos and Negroes.

The situation has begun to improve slowly over the last decade, but most of the movement has occurred in only two areas: California and New York City. That progress notwithstanding, only 452,000 persons 25 years old and older have attended one or more years of college - less than 12 percent of those in that age group. Of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, those with some college total a shocking 4 and 6 percent, respectively. The comparable figure for all adults is 21 percent.

LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL FACTORS

There is a strong sense of cultural uniqueness among the Spanish-speaking population, coupled with feelings akin to outrage that the broader society fails to recognize, accept and even place a positive value on their contribution to the diverse fabric of American society. Spanish-speaking leaders tend to be highly critical of DOL, the State Employment Service, school systems and other purveyors of manpower services for failing to take into account these "unique" cultural characteristics.

At one level of response, of course, the group's own perception of uniqueness becomes a factor for the rest of the nation to reckon with, quite apart from the specific differences. At a minimum, it would warrant involving spokesmen for the group in decisions about aspects of the program that are related to cultural factors. Manpower programs have adopted this approach with other minority groups - as evidenced by counseling, motivation, and other programs designed by and for Negroes to foster "Black pride" and self-image. Attempts of this sort to influence attitudes and behavior have come to be recognized as a necessary corollary to upgrading job skills and education. Few such efforts, however, have been undertaken with Spanish-speaking groups - Operation SER representing the major exception.

To some extent, the felt cultural differences of Spanish-speaking Americans result in part from the high proportion of the group experiencing poverty. In this sense, they do have many characteristics that differentiate them from mainstream American society, but may be shared in common with Negroes, Appalachian whites or others experiencing a "poverty subculture."

There are, however, very real differences that affect the conduct and success of manpower programs. They fall in four areas, summarized below:*

- Language
- Value orientation
- Ethnic isolation
- Other social and psychological factors

1. Language. Comparative studies have shown that Spanish is the most prevalent of all foreign languages in the U.S., and the one most likely to survive in the society on a permanent basis. Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans diverge from earlier generations of immigrants in persisting in the use of their language over several generations. Access to Spanish language mass media and entertainment permits the continuance of this pattern. Fewer economic incentives to learn English (a reflection of limited opportunities) and less severe acculturation pressures from children than previous immigrant groups are cited as contributing factors.

According to the November 1969 Census figures, roughly one Spanish-speaking adult in four is illiterate in English. For Puerto Ricans 25 years and over 40.3 percent are unable to read and write English. Youth tend to have a better command of the language, and even in the 10-24 year age group, 1 out of 5 Puerto Ricans and 1 out of 20 Mexican Americans is illiterate in English. One out of 4 persons 14 years and olver in households where Spanish is usually spoken is illiterate in Spanish and 2 out of 5 are illiterate in English. This suggests that a large number lack a working command of either language. There are only minor differences between males and females in language competence. Current information is not available on the number of monolinguals who lack a speaking knowledge of English; however informed estimates suggest that it is in excess of 10 percent, and it is probably well over 25 percent in many communities, ethnic neighborhoods, and among migrants. A 1960 study* in Los Angeles and San Antonio found that 29 percent in the former city could not "get along comfortably" conversing in English; a high 43 percent in the Texas community had difficulty handling the language. By contrast, over half were bilingual, able to converse in either language freely. Among Puerto Ricans, the situation is probably somewhat worse.

---

*The discussion that follows attempts to highlight, in a form useful for manpower planners, some aspects of a complex culture. Scholars are not in agreement in all these issues and the existing research literature is somewhat incomplete. These findings should be treated as a preliminary working hypothesis subject to testing, verification and modification in actual manpower programs.

Language difficulties compound the educational lag, and the reverse is likewise true. Only modest efforts by manpower and education agencies have been made to cope with these language barriers, mount bilingual programs, or tailor services to monolinguals and functionally illiterate Spanish-speaking persons.

2. Value orientation. While generalizations about value differences can quickly fall prey to stereotyping, some cultural attributes related to manpower programs seem to apply to many Spanish-speaking persons:

- Interpersonal relations - greater weight is given to relations between individuals than to competitive, materialistic or achievement norms
- Strong family ties
- La raza - pride in a unique ethnic heritage, connoting a sense of solidarity and sometimes reflecting overtones of racial superiority contrasted with a supposedly "corrupt" Anglo culture.
- Machismo - male dominance, patriarchy, emphasis on man's masculinity, and a submissive traditional female (especially pronounced among Mexican Americans)
- Aspirations for professional rather than business or managerial occupations

---

*Grebler et al, op cit, p. 424

To some extent these attributes are carried over from an older rural culture. Recent studies of Spanish-speaking Americans in an urban setting suggest a tendency to absorb performance-oriented and other "Anglo" norms particularly as interaction with the broader society increases. However, these traits are markedly persistent and there is little basis for the assumption that they will materially change in the present generation. Also there is sharp disagreement within the Spanish-speaking community on the need for or value of assimilation. Efforts at forcing language and cultural assimilation, as in the practice of many Texas schools until recent years of forbiding the child to speak Spanish, are generally recognized to be counterproductive.

3. Ethnic isolation. The isolation of the Spanish-speaking community is significantly more pronounced than that of earlier generations of immigrants. Until World War II, the Spanish-speaking congregated in rural areas in agricultural occupations, whereas earlier waves of immigrants generally flowed to the cities where economic and social pressures of the melting pot were greater. By the time the Spanish-speaking population began to urbanize, their numbers were great enough and their attempt to develop a subculture that could survive in this country sufficiently successful that they managed to retain an enclave culture. Spanish has been far more dominant than any other foreign language in this country and those wishing to rely on Spanish newspapers and radio can do so (TV somewhat less so).

Although it is relatively easy for a fair skinned, well educated Mexican American, who speaks English without an accent to be accepted, and even marry an Anglo wife, such persons make up only a small fraction of the population.

The overwhelming majority of the Spanish-speaking live in self-contained neighborhoods separated from the rest of the community. In some cases, this represents a choice of the individual to live in familiar

(2.

surroundings among friends and relatives. All too often, however, the condition results from economic or social discrimination, and the individual lives in substandard housing in an area having few public services - such barrios are similar in all respects to Negro ghettoes. Studies of metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles indicate that the chances of a Spanish-speaking person of a given income level occupying substandard housing are over four times that for Anglos.

Given income levels, occupational distribution and educational disabilities of the Spanish-speaking people, a great deal of support will be needed from society if they are to overcome discrimination and ethnic isolation and to be able to experience the opportunities enjoyed by mainstream America.

4. Other social and psychological factors

There are other important variables which, though relatively little research information is available about them, are regarded by some knowledgeable manpower specialists as pivotal in gaining an understanding of how to develop and carry out successful programs for Spanish-speaking Americans. These include:

- Emotionalism. There is a behaviorial pattern seen in Chicanos and other Spanish-speaking persons of giving way to intense emotional reactions that can lead to the individual acting contrary to his best interests. While this is hardly a monopoly of any single ethnic group, it tends to be excused or even praised within the Spanish culture. This factor is a problem not only for the Chicano commuting to the factor from the barrio but poses even greater difficulty for Spanish-speaking persons as they reach executive levels of responsibility. Such behavior is neither understood nor rewarded in mainstream American society, but few answers are known as to how to channel these psychic energies in more constructive avenues.

- Personalism. Unlike the individualism which grows out of the frontier spirit so much a part of Anglo-Americans, Spanish culture emphasizes a personalism that is frequently unrelated to any notions of self-interest or considerations of practical advantage. Subject to an impersonal society and economy based on the individualistic ethic, the Spanish-speaking functions at a competitive disadvantage and can easily experience frustration and alienation.

- Resistance to change. The Spanish-speaking represent a continuum of acculturation. At one end of the continuum, many respond to the factors of change and "progress" valued generally in our society. At the other extreme, the disadvantaged that represent the primary concern of manpower programs, change is seen as a threat.

- Noncompetitiveness. Spanish and Anglo cultures differ greatly on this score and it is manifested in less emphasis on status and prestige, the accumulation of wealth, climbing the occupational ladder, "success", etc.

- Time focus. Spanish-speaking persons tend to focus on the present rather than future events, and hence suffer in those areas of the society where economic opportunity and security place a high premium on basing present actions on future consequences.

Many of the above cultural characteristics, except language, are shared in greater or lesser degree by other disadvantaged ethnic groups and have many parallels in a "culture of poverty". However, their manifestation among Spanish-speaking Americans has sufficiently unique features to warrant special emphasis and further study.

CHAPTER II

AN ASSESSMENT OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The focus of activity since the Study Group was launched in March 1971 has been twofold - to obtain data and information on how manpower programs are now being carried out, and to seek inputs from program administrators and target group organizations on the Action Plan and recommendations. Field visits were made by the study team (composed of four Chicano and Puerto Rican manpower specialists* working with our regular staff) to 20 communities** of high concentration of Spanish-speaking population. These visits were one or two days each and were not intended as evaluations. The purpose was to have conclusions about national program activities grounded in observations of actual field operations, rather than to develop conclusions about individual projects.

Meetings were held with national and regional officials of Federal agencies involved in manpower, including the U.S. Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

---

*Study Group Spanish-speaking members were Sam Bell, Louis A. Cardona, Ricardo Ontiveros, and Macario Mesa Ramirez. TLA regular staff members were Robert L. Thompson, Project Director; Raymond C. Collins, Project Manager; Authur Boyd, Director of Analytical Design; and Lee Franklin, Consultant.

**Communities visited include (by region): (I) Boston, Hartford; (II) Hoboken, Newark, New York City, Puerto Rico; (V) Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee; (VI) Albuquerque, El Paso, Laredo, San Antonio; (VII) Kansas City, Missouri; (VII) Denver; (IX) Fresno, Oakland, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose. The Study Group cancelled plans to visit Los Angeles after a few manpower program operators in that city complained to the DOL regional office that they did not want to participate in the study.

Every effort was made to build upon previous research, evaluation, and other studies, including the November 1970 report of the Spanish-speaking Manpower Task Force entitled, The Spanish-speaking in the United States of America: Recommended Policies and Approaches to Overcoming Barriers to Employment.

Since DOL does not regularly report employment statistics or the extent of participation in manpower programs for persons of Spanish origin, a priority emphasis of the study was to assemble such hard data as was obtainable, given resource and time constraints. For the first time it is possible to document, with a high degree of confidence, the relative manpower status of the Spanish-speaking population. The Action Plan highlights the need and suggests ways routinely to collect such data to "keep score" on efforts to improve the conditions of this severely disadvantaged group.

The Study Group appreciates DOL cooperation in undertaking special computer runs and making available information to show characteristics of Spanish-speaking participants in manpower programs.* Other data requested, including information on terminations and program results, will not be available until late August. At that time, DOL plans to publish the data as a statistical appendix to this report, giving national totals and data for 23 states and selected communities of high target group concentration for the following programs: MDTA (Institutional and OJT); WIN; and CEP. National data summaries will be available also for New Careers, NYC, and Operation Mainstream.

---

*Manpower program data cited in the report, unless otherwise noted, are those official program statistics reported by local and state manpower agencies and compiled by the Office of Manpower and Management Data Systems, Manpower Administration.

HOW THE FIELD VISITS WERE CARRIED OUT

The members of the Study Group, assembled variously into teams of at least two, conducted field visits in 20 cities. Meetings and interviews were held with over 150 respondents, all of whom were central figures in manpower or manpower-related organizations or were private sector employers of Spanish-speaking Americans. Primary missions of respondent manpower organizations include community-wide manpower planning, manpower development and training, the delivery of temporary services (like unemployment insurance), referral of applicants directly to employment or to training programs, and advocacy of the needs of the local Spanish-speaking community. In-depth discussions of the manpower problems of the Spanish-speaking, and workable solutions to those problems, were held with key personnel of 7 Regional Offices, 11 Mayor's CAMPS Coordination Offices, 9 Concentrated Employment Programs, 3 Work Incentive Projects, 20 Local Employment Service Offices, 6 NAB Metro Offices, 12 MDTA-funded Skill Centers, 6 Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs, 12 Community Action Agencies, 7 Model Cities Organizations, 1 OIC, 9 private sector employer establishments, several dozen regional and local organizations whose prime concern is the welfare of Spanish-speaking Americans, and a wide spectrum of other agencies and groups related to manpower.

QUALITY OF THE DATA

Since the time and resource constraints under which the study was carried out required sifting a great amount of information,* and arriving at sound recommendations quickly, it seemed desirable to compare the findings and conclusions with earlier studies. The basic findings concur with those reached in the November 1970 report of the Spanish-speaking Manpower Task Force and the sources on which that report relied. In fact there is considerable consistency in the conclusions reached by the relatively few manpower studies that have been carried out related to Spanish-speaking Americans. Perhaps the most comprehensive such effort was a 1967 in-depth field evaluation of manpower services to Mexican Americans in five Southwestern States conducted by a DOL team. This report was made available for Study Group use although it has never been made public. Its recommendations (some of which were implemented at the time) are still valid today.

---

*The bulk of which was impressionistic or anecdotal - or, if "hard" data, not necessarily complete or organized in a form for ready analysis. In the absence of indications to the contrary, considerable reliance can be placed on a consensus of informed observors.

In some areas, available data is too sketchy or inconclusive to support far-reaching programmatic recommendations. Here, interim actions are proposed to lay in place the foundation stones for later program development. Also concrete moves are outlined to make available needed data.

BASIC FINDINGS

The principal findings resulting from an analysis of field visits and other data pertaining to manpower services to Spanish-speaking Americans confirm the view that this group experiences a low level of participation in such programs relative to need, and that the results of such participation in terms of earnings, job retention and upgrading tend to be poor. Specifically:

- Manpower programs are not tailored to the unique language and cultural characteristics of Spanish-speaking Americans
- Few Spanish-speaking persons or organizations have been involved in the planning and delivery of manpower and related services

- The proportion of Spanish-speaking enrollees in manpower programs tends to be lower than that for other disadvantaged groups and bears no clear relation to needs
- Manpower programs generally emphasize numbers of program participants at the expense of including monolinguals and other severely disadvantaged Spanish-speaking persons and without adequate regard to the quality of results for participants
- DOL, State Employment Services, school systems and other manpower providers have not developed and implemented policies giving priority to the needs of the Spanish-speaking people as has been done in the case of some other disadvantaged groups (e.g. Negroes).

A further discussion of these issues follows:

1. Language and Cultural Characteristics Overlooked

As a general rule, manpower programs make little or no effort to tailor services to the special needs of Spanish-speaking enrollees. In the absence of key staff members or an Advisory Board composed of Spanish-speaking persons, program administrators lack access to advice on what the needs are or how to meet them. The problem is not an easy one, and even Spanish-speaking manpower organizations are only beginning to develop the necessary state of the art.

Language is the most obvious and pressing difficulty and it is directly related to education. Language training is sometimes seen as the only need of the Spanish-speaking which is not shared by other ethnic or racial groups. However, as was pointed out by knowledgeable Spanish-speaking manpower specialists, to conclude that English-as-a-Second-Language is the only modification in services needed to tailor a manpower program to serve the Spanish-speaking would be simplistic, and would lead to failure.

That there is a relation between education and opportunity is clear. The fact that lack of education is the largest single barrier to employment opportunity is unarguable. The statistics on education of the Spanish-speaking disadvantaged in areas of high population concentrations indicate the need for more responsive public education systems:

- In California, of those Mexican Americans who start school, 50 percent drop out before completing 8th grade; 67 percent drop out before completing high school
- In New York City, 52 percent of those who begin high school drop out before completing
- In San Antonio, the average grade level attained by the Spanish-speaking disadvantaged is 4.5.

In manpower programs, the lack of education is in many areas a barrier to training. The entry requirements for skill training are fairly well standardized across the country. The entry grade attainment level varies in the range from 8th to 11th. To close the gap for the Spanish-speaking, the obvious solution is to incorporate Adult Continuing Education into the employability development plan.

The San Antonio CEP provides Adult Continuing Education using teaching materials written in English. The DOL Regional Office recently waived a guideline limiting Adult Continuing Education (full time) for any one individual to 16 weeks. In the time allowed, the CEP could not raise the functional level of its Spanish-speaking enrollees to the entry level for skill training courses. The maximum according to current guidelines is 25 weeks. Not enough experience has been gained to know whether 25 weeks is sufficient.

Operation SER has orientation, counseling and prevocational training materials focused on the cultural characteristics of Mexican Americans. It is starting to develop training strategies for monolinguals and bilingual and bicultural curricula.

The BOLT (Basic Occupational Language Training) program operated by the Puerto Rican Forum offers job related English language instruction tailored to the needs of the Spanish-speaking community.

OEO-funded migrant programs have often developed flexible approaches to language training and education.

Except for these efforts, there are few programs that attempt to cope with the problem.

Bad examples, unfortunately, were plentiful. People who don't know what to do, do what they know. Program administrators would tend to assign Chicanos or Puerto Ricans to program components designed for, and often run by, Negroes, presumably on the grounds that if you've seen one minority you've seen them all. Spanish-speaking enrollees are angered or apathetic in the face of courses emphasizing "Black pride" or "Black history". One can imagine how Negroes or Anglos would react if the roles were reversed and they were exposed to courses in La raza and machismo to help prepare them for jobs.

One JOBS '70 Contractor was experiencing a failure rate for the Spanish-speaking more than twice that of other minority groups. The reasons were apparent. The employer was not prepared to deal with the Spanish-speaking in several crucial ways. The instructors for OJT courses were Negroes who were well acquainted with the language and norms of the Negro ghetto, but could not communicate with the Spanish-speaking, who did not have a good command of English. Likewise, the counselors, who were Anglo and Negro, did not know how to deal with the Spanish-speaking females who were experiencing problems with husbands who did not want them to work. Finally, a Spanish-speaking priest and nun were called in on a volunteer basis to do counseling.

Another employer had consciously elected to provide no special treatment to persons hired under the JOBS '70 contract. Not only were no supportive services offered, but the company did not inform the supervisors that new hires under the contract were Spanish-speaking and disadvantaged. The contract had been in effect for only a few weeks; 3 of the 14 hired were still on board.

2. Few Spanish-speaking involved in program planning and operations.

The Manpower Administration in recent years has adopted a policy of requiring the Employment Service to match the minority group composition of local staffs with local population patterns. There is a need for further efforts to strengthen ES and other manpower agencies to help them achieve this goal as far as the Spanish-speaking population is concerned.

Except for a handful of Spanish-speaking manpower organizations, there are almost no examples of programs adequately staffed with Spanish-speaking manpower professionals or that utilize target residents effectively in an advisory capacity. In the Southwest, for example, the situation of lack of participation of Mexican Americans in the planning and administration of manpower programs that affect them, described in a 1967 evaluation carried out by DOL staff, still holds true in broad outline today. The comparative complacency at this situation and at high unemployment rates and poverty on the part of many public officials notes in that study, unfortunately, is also still true today, despite notable improvements in many areas.

The public employment picture for the Spanish-speaking is particularly dismal. Public school systems statistics indicate that in areas of highest population concentration less than half of the Spanish-speaking complete high school. A far lesser proportion complete college. Yet positions with government agencies carry job specifications and advancement criteria that effectively restrict the Spanish-speaking from obtaining positions from which they can bring about change. The Texas Employment Commission, whose clientele is largely Spanish-speaking, employs 13 percent Spanish-speaking, about 50 percent of whom are in semiprofessional and nonprofessional positions. The Hartford Local ES office plans to serve about 12,000 Spanish-speaking in the next fiscal year, a large percentage of whom are migrants from Puerto Rico with little command of English; 4 of its staff are Spanish-speaking; 3 are employment aides (paraprofessional), the other a secretary. The City and County of San Diego have a population which is 15 percent Spanish-speaking; only a handful are in positions labeled "professional". The County government employs 2.5 percent Spanish-speaking. The Mayor's Manpower Coordinator in Chicago stated that the Latin community was so splintered that no one could represent them on the planning board.

The State of New Mexico Employment Security Commission showed a different pattern. Of their total staff, 51 percent is Spanish-speaking. 56 percent are classified "professional" and above. California HRD has begun to put Chicanos in charge of centers in Mexican-American target areas and has stepped up its employment efforts.

In the majority of cases, though, the complaint was the same. "We need more Spanish-speaking employees, but we cannot find people who are qualified. And the merit system will not allow us to hire and upgrade the less qualified, except in paraprofessional positions. And in those cases we don't have the resources to upgrade as we should. They simply need to wait until they can score competitively on the standard examinations".

DOL, for its part, needs to consider the example it is setting for the hiring of Spanish-speaking Americans. Two supergrade positions are occupied by Mexican-Americans. Recent recruitment efforts have increased the number of Spanish-speaking to 104, but most hold relatively low level positions with limited opportunities to influence policy or program direction. Puerto Rican representation is slight. Other Federal agencies are even worse, except for a few such as OEO. Throughout the Federal Government, the number of Spanish-speaking supergrades stood at 18 in November 1970, in comparison with 14 a year earlier.

DOL has taken no steps to stimulate the involvement of Spanish-speaking manpower organizations in planning and program development at the state and local level. In a few instances, principally in California, Spanish-speaking groups have gained a role in the CAMPS planning. For the most part, even this has been focused on commenting on their own funding proposals rather than general advice and guidance. In San Jose a Chicano with the backing of local Spanish-speaking manpower organizations was selected as the Mayor's Manpower Coordinator.

There is no operational, community-based manpower planning system for allocating resources in the light of local priorities and no present mechanisms for otherwise focusing planning on the needs of disadvantaged Spanish-speaking Americans.

3. Low levels of participation

There are no criteria of "parity" or "fair share" established in legislation or Administration policy by which to judge the adequacy of the participation of the Spanish-speaking. As a result manpower program administrators are free to set their own participation standards -- or, by not acting, to settle for whoever walks in the door.

The pattern of participation varies widely. At one end of the spectrum, in Chicago, with over a quarter of a million Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans, virtually no identifiable programs for Spanish-speaking persons are underway. By contrast, in Albuquerque, where the Spanish-speaking constitute 37 percent of the disadvantaged population, they represent over 75 percent of the enrollment of the area's manpower programs.

The pattern generally reflects who has control of the community's political system as well as who runs the manpower agencies. Where ethnic groups, either Negro or Spanish-speaking, are in the saddle, they look first to the interests of their own people.* Anglos in charge have tended over the past few years to cater to the dominant ethnic group.

---

*Of the 20 communities visited by the Study Group, in only eight (including Puerto Rico) does the Spanish-speaking group exercise substantial influence. This group of sites includes nearly half of the cities of high population concentration in Table II, Chapter I.

The Director of the Illinois Division of Employment Security cited the State's efforts to do more for Spanish-speaking Americans. He said that of the $20,000,000 expended by the Department of Labor annually in Illinois, only $32,900 is identifiably aimed at the Spanish-speaking community. No more than six persons in the State ES structure are Spanish-speaking; only one is in a supervisory position. Yet Illinois has the fourth highest concentration of Spanish-speaking persons of any state in the nation.

Sometimes ethnic "tipping" results from a blatant power struggle (e.g., Oakland or Hoboken). Often it "just happens" and administrators are open to change when constructive alternatives are pointed out. DOL at the national level is not responsible for creating this pattern, but it may need to explore existing policies that add up to a passive approach of funding whatever agencies are out there as to whether this has the effect of reinforcing a status quo that works to the detriment of the Spanish-speaking population.

Another factor limiting participation is the reluctance of the Spanish-speaking to deal with governmental institutions, particularly ES and the schools. The suspicion many poor people have of establishment agencies is enhanced by the experience of Mexican Americans with forcible repatriation into the 1950's. When outreach and counseling are carried out by Spanish-speaking organizations this is generally sufficient to overcome enrollee inhibitions and fears of failure and rejection by public agencies.

The proximity of training and service centers as a factor affecting parity was dramatized in the cities where resources are disproportionately channeled to the Negro communities.* Training centers are located, for the most part in or near the Negro ghettos. The Spanish-speaking typically do not mix freely with the Negroes in social or residential patterns. Neither do they feel welcome in programs or in program components that are predominantly Negro. Reports from the CEPs in Omaha and in Kansas City indicated that despite special efforts to recruit the Spanish-speaking into programs located in the heart of their Negro ghettos, they did not succeed in approaching their Spanish-speaking enrollment goals until satellite training centers were established in the barrios. Likewise, the State ES in California has moved to establish HRD centers within disadvantaged communities; to attract clients who would not otherwise use the services of "downtown" local offices.

---

*As a percent of total resources -- this does not suggest that resources provided to the Negro community are in excess of, or even approach, what is needed, since this is not the case in any of the communities visited.

In many cities, notably Boston, Hartford, Newark and Chicago, attempts have been made to direct the Spanish-speaking into predominantly Negro training centers by funding Spanish-speaking organizations to operate outreach/service centers in the barrios. These operations are characterized by unclear strategies, weak management, poor controls and general lack of success. In Boston, one such agency has no definitive records pertaining to results, provides a broad range of referral and other services, but does not do follow-up, and from the performance summaries of the major manpower programs, has made no significant impact on enrollment. In Chicago, another Spanish-speaking organization, funded to gain entrance for their constituents into MDTA Skills Training courses, reports little success despite hard work.

A special point was made in the majority of cities visited in regard to the client-service staffing pattern in manpower programs. The argument was put forward, although there is no specific data to substantiate or disprove it, that the trust and confidence of a potential client must be gained immediately by the client-service staff if real help is to be given by the program. It is argued further that a "front-line" of Negro or Anglo faces is counterproductive in a program which intends to serve the Spanish-speaking poor.

On the other side of the ledger, OIC (Opportunities Industrialization Center) is running an apparently effective program in San Jose, serving a majority of Chicanos. The director and several of the staff are Spanish-speaking. Spanish-speaking organizations tend to be outspokenly critical of such arrangements in which Negroes are the channel for funds and control services to the Spanish-speaking target group. The San Jose OIC is cited not to endorse this approach, but to suggest some of the factors that must be present to make it work.

4. Numbers vs. quality of services.

Constructive pressures for better management and effective use of the manpower dollar at the national level often get interpreted as a "numbers game" at the operating level. The emphasis is placed on numbers enrolled at a given cost. Criteria must become more sophisticated and stress placements, starting salaries, retention rates and opportunities for upgrading. As such factors are considered, the benefits derived from program participation appear even less for the Spanish-speaking enrollees. Drop out rates are higher, starting salaries tend to be substantially lower, "stick rates" are poor, and few instances of career upgrading are reported.

Another dilemma faces the Spanish-speaking - as with all disadvantaged groups - that of "creaming". Pressures for demonstrable program results often lead to selection of enrollees with "success-prone" characteristics at the expense of the "hard core" or severely disadvantaged. This poses a special hardship for Chicanos and Puerto Ricans at the bottom of the educational ladder in view of the high cost and extended training periods called for with an uncertain outcome. Inflexible guidelines and funding procedures worsen an already difficult situation. Even Spanish-speaking manpower organizations are reluctant to include monolinguals and the severely educationally disadvantaged for fear they will be criticized for high costs and a poor performance record. It is clear that the system rewards "creaming" even while condemning it.

A case example may make the above points somewhat more specific. The reporting system designed by the National Office of the Concentrated Employment Program stands out as a results-oriented tool which has great potential for helping local CEP management zero-in on operating problems. The Boston CEP was able to provide key performance indicators and had begun to array those figures separately for the Spanish-speaking, as indicated in Table IV.

56

TABLE VIII. BOSTON CEP PERFORMANCE

SUMMARY

Data Element	Spanish-speaking	Other
1. Disadvantaged in the city	22,500 (18%)	100,000 (82%)
2. Enrollment this program year	950 (17%)	4,738 (83%)
3. Enrollment in Skill Training	300 (15%)	1,673 (85%)
4. Successful completions of skill training as a % of starts	140 (46%)	820 (50%)
5. Enrollment in human service careers program	20 (6%)	283 (94%)
6. Successful completions of human service career programs as a % of starts	0 (0%)	35 (8%)
7. Average number of dependents/enrollee	3	2
8. Average starting wage for persons placed within previous 90 days	$2.35/hour	$2.50/hour
9. Average education functional level on enrollment	6th Grade	10th Grade

Enrollment of the Spanish-speaking looks respectable in terms of the goal that fair share considerations might dictate, although the program does not have an enrollment goal for the Spanish-speaking.

A closer investigation of the conditions underlying the Boston CEP performance summary revealed the need for a breakdown of performance indicators for subgroups within the Spanish-speaking minority. The subgroups of interest in Boston are Puerto Ricans (by far the majority of the Spanish-speaking in the Boston region and for the most part settled out of the northeast U.S. migrant stream), and immigrants from South and Central America. As the result of immigration standards for South and Central Americans, that group is better educated and has a greater incidence of marketable skills than the Puerto Ricans.

The Boston CEP runs an exemplary skill training program for the Spanish-speaking (PESO program). It trains women in banking machine operations, but it has not yet found effective ways to enroll and succeed with the Puerto Rican female. A spot sample of a NAB/JOBS '70 contract let in conjunction with that program to a local bank showed that 87 percent of the girls placed with the bank are Central and South Americans. The remainder are Puerto Rican.

5. Manpower providers don't give priority to Spanish-speaking participants.

Data systems provide a good clue as to the issues important to program administrators. Clearly, no one has started to "keep score" on the Spanish-speaking population. Most manpower programs can look to their information systems for the percentage of individuals enrolled who are of Spanish surname. They cannot, however, without a considerable investment in ad hoc studies, find out the various kinds of training going to the Spanish-speaking; or what percentage of the Spanish-speaking succeed in various kinds of training, as compared to Anglos and other minority groups; or what percentage of their placements are of Spanish-speaking trainees, as compared with other groups; or how the average starting wage for Spanish-speaking placements compared with that of other groups, and with the average hourly wage at enrollment; or how the referral-to-placement ratio for Spanish-speaking trainees compares with that of other groups of trainees; or the retention rates of Spanish-speaking placements as compared with Anglos and other minorities.

These data elements are key to consciousness on the parts of program planners, operators and evaluators of how equitably and how effectively their programs are meeting the needs of the Spanish-speaking community. Moreover, these kinds of data form the most reliable indicators available to program management of how operating results measure up to intended results, and where to invest limited time to bring about maximum improvement in operating performance, as DOL has found in its experience with improving the management of the CEP program.

While it is generally possible to determine from manpower data the relevant age, education, income, etc., characteristics of the total community of disadvantaged, it is not possible to determine those characteristics for the Spanish-speaking community. One cannot safely assume that on each parameter the Spanish-speaking statistics would equal those of other minority groups. Nor, as was pointed out earlier, is it safe to assume that, within the Spanish-speaking community, Cuban and Central and South American statistics would equal those of Puerto Ricans in the Northeast or Chicanos in the Southwest. Disadvantaged Puerto Ricans and Chicanos are generally less educated, have more dependents and are most likely to have households headed by males than Negroes in their geographical areas. Programs designed to serve them should consequently have a different mix of services than one designed to serve Negroes. Lumping the Spanish-speaking together with other minorities has the effect of distorting (by underestimating) their needs.

A second, significant distortion of need among the Spanish-speaking derives from the common practice of projecting the needs of the net-yet-served from the characteristics of the previously enrolled. If a cross-section of the Spanish-speaking community were enrolled each year, their demographic statistics would fairly characterize the remainder. However, the experience of some manpower agencies -- notably the Boston CEP's PESO program - suggests a pattern of recruiting selectively from the Spanish-speaking community in order to find individuals well enough qualified to succeed in skill training. Also the Laredo Skill Center Coordinator said flatly, "we are having a lot of difficulty finding people who can make it through our program".

The chief danger in this practice is that new programs will be designed to serve people whose needs are less severe than the target population, and that, as the most employable people are skimmed off the top, the program design will lag in effectiveness year after year.

. Furthermore, the current data gathering process does not provide for the need to key several important statistics on the one which could be used to isolate a target group for a project. If, for example, a project were envisioned for Spanish-speaking mothers of three or more school-aged children, the statistics on all data parameters would need to be isolated for that target group.

Another index of priority is official statements of Administration policy. Notwithstanding the Department's intent to improve manpower services to Spanish-speaking Americans, such pronouncements have been notably lacking with regard to this group. An analysis of the Manpower Report of the President for 1971 and recent years reveals that Negro is used as virtually synononomous with minority, and that official "minority" statistics do not include the Spanish-speaking population. Program administrators at Federal, State and local levels have stated that priority for the disadvantaged and minorities is interpreted as meaning priority for Negroes. This is praiseworthy as belated recognition of the dramatic poverty and discrimination affecting Negroes in America - in fact, existing resources fall far short of what is required to meet the needs of the Negro community. However, it should be clearly understood that such efforts do nothing to meet the equally pressing needs of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking Americans.

What is called for is a statement of priority that takes into account the needs of all disadvantaged groups - Spanish-speaking, Negroes, Appalachian whites, American Indians and others.

PROGRAM DATA

DOL has processed special computer runs to pull together information on intake forms on Spanish-speaking enrollee characteristics in a format developed to permit cross-tabulation of characteristics and comparisons with other ethnic groups. Other data showing information on terminations and program results is expected to be processed in a few weeks and DOL plans to publish detailed tabulations at that time, including state and community breakouts for areas of high concentration of Spanish-speaking population.

There are certain minor discrepancies in the data, since there was no time to "debug" the system. Data for ethnic groups does not add up to the "Total", because the breakout calculations were performed slightly later in the year. Also Spanish-speaking enrollees are double counted in the "white" figures, rather than being excluded to give a count for Anglos which would be a more meaningful comparison. The net effect is to statistically overestimate the percentage of Spanish-speaking enrollees relative to the total and underestimate their proportion relative to Anglos. These discrepancies probably do not seriously change the interpretation of results, but highlight areas of needed improvement if the production of such data becomes a routine operation as the Action Plan recommends.

As the data in Table V indicate, Spanish-speaking enrollment in manpower programs (for which comparative ethnic data are available) ranges from a low of 8 percent in MDTA/OJT to a high of 39 percent in NYC, Out of School. This compares with a low of 24 percent for whites in NAB/JOBS and a high of 65 percent in MDTA/OJT. The extremes for Negro participation range from 23 percent in Operation Mainstream to 65 percent in CEP.

Furthermore, those programs with relatively low rates of Spanish-speaking participation - NAB/JOBS, MDTA, and Job Corps- are the major manpower activities and include the principal opportunities for institutional training. NYC and Operation Mainstream, although highly popular among the Spanish-speaking community, are work support programs that do relatively little to upgrade skills.

An analysis of field visits suggests that a participation rate of 21 percent for CEP may somewhat overstate the significance of this program for the Spanish-speaking. As a rule, CEP programs are located in ethnic poverty neighborhoods, sometimes just across the street from the principal Spanish-speaking area. Spanish-speaking staff seldom have key roles. Spanish-speaking organizations may be called upon to do the outreach (even on a volunteer, not-for-pay basis). Counseling and other program supportive services tend to be weak in many cases. The result is that many of those who get in the front door fail to complete the program successfully.

TABLE IX. Enrollees in Manpower Programs for Spanish-Speaking Americans and Selected Other Ethnic Groups - July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970*

Manpower Programs	Total Enrollees	Percent of Total Enrollees		
		Spanish-speaking	White	Negro
CEP	58,337	21	25	65
WIN	52,176	20	49	40
NYC, Out of School	45,316	39	46	41
MDTA, Institutional	60,134	13	58	35
MDTA, OJT	45,727	8	65	29
Operation Mainstream	6,743	31	55	23
New Careers	1,637	36	31	61
NAB/JOBS (Contract** and Non-Contract)	229,338	13	24	69
Job Corps	40,000	10	25	63

*Source: Office of Manpower and Management Data Systems for all programs except Job Corps

**As of December 31, 1970 adjusted to reflect total enrollees reporting ethnic status

During the first six months of this fiscal year*, the Employment Service placed 732,253 persons in nonagricultural jobs, of whom 7.1 percent were of Spanish origin while 36 percent of those placed were Negroes. In agricultural jobs, the respective percentages were 25.7 and 10, reflecting the traditional high concentration of the Spanish-speaking in temporary farm work. It is clear that the substantial increase in ES services to the disadvantaged has tended principally to benefit Negroes, relative to Spanish-speaking persons.

---

*ESARS (Employment Security Automated Reporting System) data available for 43 States, including all states with sizeable Spanish-speaking populations.

6

CHAPTER III

ACTION PLAN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

National manpower policy has gone through a decade of dramatic change and the Administration is considering major new departures in the planning and management of manpower programs and in building on the concept of the Opportunities for Families Program (OFP) that puts manpower at the center of a total human services strategy.

Spanish-speaking Americans received relatively few of the benefits of manpower programs over the past decade, since despite their disadvantaged status they were not perceived as a priority target group for the delivery of social program services. Unless bold new departures in policy formulation and execution are effected Spanish-speaking Americans could fare no better as a result of further changes in manpower delivery systems.

This chapter proposes for the Department's consideration:

- A far-reaching Action Plan for bringing the performance of manpower programs into line with the Administration's intention to improve the life chances of Spanish-speaking people
- A detailed Implementation Plan, providing suggested next steps for each element in the Action Plan.

A coordinated strategy across a broad front is required to bring Spanish-speaking Americans into the mainstream of economic opportunity. The proposed Action Plan is based on a strategy with two parallel thrusts. On the one hand are specific actions designed to build long-run capability in the Department for understanding (and disseminating an understanding of) how to deliver effective services to the Spanish-speaking, taking into account their special manpower needs (without overlooking the broad group of characteristics they share with other disadvantaged and minority groups). On the other hand are the specific actions aimed at strengthening current mainstream manpower efforts. It is these "big dollar" program investments, in the final analysis, that must transmit the benefits of the Department's intentions to large numbers in the nation's barrios.

The Action Plan is formulated around this strategy, as follows:

Section A: Building the long-run capability to serve the Spanish-speaking effectively

- Developing effective bilingual and bicultural programs
- Research and demonstration
- Strategic involvement of the Spanish-speaking in finding answers and mounting responsive programs

Section B: Strengthening mainstream manpower programs

- Policy and goals
- Strategic manpower planning
- Public employment
- Eliminating discrimination and barriers to employment
- Other program activities

ACTION PLAN

A. Building the Long-Run Capability to Serve the Spanish-Speaking Effectively

1. Bilingual and Bicultural Programs

The central consensus of many observors in commenting on ways to reorient program activities was that a bilingual-bicultural approach linking manpower and education offered the greatest leverage. The creation of such a program would require the combined efforts and experience of several Federal agencies, particularly DOL, the U.S. Office of Education (OE), and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

No comprehensive program model of this sort is in existence to our knowledge, although we have seen promising project elements that attempt to move in this direction:

- Basic Occupational Language Training (BOLT), an experimental project operated by the Puerto Rican Forum in New York City with DOL funds, is testing a varied program of occupational language training for Spanish-speaking workers.
- Operation SER is beginning to design special bilingual programs for monolinguals and the severely educationally disadvantaged
- Several OEO-funded migrant programs (e.g., the United Migrant Opportunity Service of Wisconsin) have begun to develop innovative manpower-education components
- The Southwest Educational Research Laboratory in Albuquerque has been involved in bilingual research

A bilingual-bicultural program model would need to accomplish breakthroughs in these areas:

- The capability for training programs to go beyond minimum grade level qualifications to take Spanish-speaking enrollees from wherever they are left by the school system as far as they must go to become "job ready"

- Curricula which facilitate the rate of learning by drawing on both Spanish and English, rather than inhibiting the rate of learning until it can be accomplished solely in English

- Reinforcement of the Spanish-speaking culture in ways that build on the potential in La raza for enhancing the enrollee's self image and motivation while at the same time introducing aspects of the mainstream culture essential to job success; fostering cultural pluralism rather than giving up one culture in favor of another

- Development of a cadre of bicultural instructors, counselors and other staff

A program thrust in this area would need to focus on:

1.

- Flexible institutional linkages that encourage school systems and manpower agencies to deal effectively with a broad age and ability spectrum, and without regard to current MDTA guidelines

- Development of innovative curricula

- **Training of instructors, counselors and other staff**
- **Involvement of educational labs, universities, and other groups to create a broad-based capability for technical assistance**

2. Research and Demonstration

2 A formal R&D plan for the Spanish-speaking should be developed by DOL in cooperation with other agencies to find answers to problems identified in the body of the report. Priority in funding research efforts should be given to operating agencies, particularly Spanish-speaking manpower organizations (e.g., Operation SER, Puerto Rican Forum).

Specifically, the R&D plan should include a time frame of how the projects will be carried out, projects to be undertaken, Spanish-speaking organization and individuals capable of sponsoring projects, and projected budgets necessary to complete those projects.

Some of the areas that need to be considered include:

- Assess R&D activities to date
- Identify Spanish-speaking American manpower projects now serving the Spanish-speaking Americans operated by Spanish-speaking Americans and assess their performance and developmental potential (if provided adequate technical assistance)
- Identify other manpower programs proposing to serve Spanish-speaking Americans

- Identify Spanish-speaking American organizations and individuals capable of operating Spanish-speaking programs and able to carry out R&D
- Develop R&D plan for Spanish-speaking Americans spelling out research areas and long run significance for program operations
- Identify research institutions, universities, and scholars that have capability in this area
- Planned variation cost-effectiveness studies of ABE and job experience to bring individual to level to participate in MDTA skills training
- Different modes of bilingual instruction
- Experimental programs for anti-drop out cooperative education combining OJT with high school education and planned by school systems, manpower agencies and employers
- Employment role of Spanish-speaking American women
- Child care and supportive manpower services for Spanish-speaking Americans
- Joint DOL-OE study of educational system's involvement in manpower for Spanish-speaking Americans, e.g., MDTA, vocational education, experience with paraprofessionals and career upgrading
- Doctoral dissertations by Spanish-speaking Americans on needs of Spanish-speaking Americans

- Counter-cultural effects on the Spanish-speaking American male-female relationship caused by new roles in Public Service Careers
- The special bilingual-bicultural differences of Spanish-speaking Americans
- "The pluralism of Spanish-speaking Americans": A focus for manpower training on ethnic in-group differences
- The role and participation of Spanish-speaking Americans in manpower programs (including cost-effectiveness analysis -- e.g., NYC, MDTA, PSC, Job Corps, NAB/JOBS)
- Programs models for the Spanish-speaking Indian, youth offenders, veterans, migrants
- A manpower information network on innovative Spanish-speaking programs in the U. S. and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

In addition, the Office of Research and Demonstration should hire on its staff several Spanish-speaking Americans at policy, evaluation, review and line positions.

3. Strategic involvement of the Spanish-speaking in the following key ways:

a. Leadership Development. DOL should work with the Civil Service Commission, OEO and other agencies in mounting a comprehensive program to upgrade Spanish-speaking leadership. First, a special Federal

TABLE X.

SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS AT GRADES GS 13-18
IN 1969 - 70

GRADE	TOTAL NUMBER IN GRADE	NUMBER OF SPANISH-SPEAKING	PERCENT OF SPANISH-SPEAKING	TOTAL NUMBER IN GRADE	NUMBER OF SPANISH-SPEAKING	PERCENT OF SPANISH-SPEAKING
	1970			1969		
GS-13	94,628	682	.7	91,728	585	.6
GS-14	46,239	328	.7	44,312	312	.7
GS-15	27,069	189	.7	25,625	154	.6
GS-16	3,857	10	.3	3,721	7	.2
GS-17	1,223	7	.6	1,113	5	.4
GS-18	506	1	.2	485	2	.4

Source: Civil Service Commission

executive recruitment program should be mounted to bring Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish-speaking into GS-16 and above positions, with a two-year target of 50 additional positions. One aspect of this program could include a systematic assessment of the career potential of the more than 500 Spanish-speaking Americans in GS-14/15 positions to identify those that, with intensive training and development, could be moved into supergrade positions within two years.

The analysis of the Civil Service Commission figures on high level employment of Spanish-speaking Americans contained in Table VI show no appreciable improvement between 1969-70, with only 18 supergrades on board as of November 1970. The 16-point program should be strengthened in these leadership areas.

In support of leadership development, DOL should work with OE to increase dramatically the total numbers of Spanish-speaking students in colleges and universities over the next five years.

b. Working with Special Purpose Spanish-Speaking Organizations. The present policy and funding practice that results in a limited scope of Spanish-speaking manpower groups should be replaced by affirmative efforts to develop the capability of those institutions to carry out those roles for which they have a comparative advantage over time. This does not mean creating a competitive delivery system (certainly not until mainstream manpower institutions have had a fair test, under conditions of parity and having access to answers of "what works", to demonstrate their capability to successfully serve persons of Spanish origin). It does call for increased funding support to manpower organizations run by Spanish-speaking groups; a massive broadening of training and technical assistance (a two-way street -- to help those groups become more effective and to use them to enable other institutions to become more responsive and to find answers); and the creation of a number of special purpose groups, such as the National Spanish-speaking Manpower Organization, recently funded by OEO. This latter group seeks to assist Federal, state and local agencies in manpower planning, and to carry out technical assistance, research, program development, and evaluation activities.

Also public information activities involving the Spanish-speaking deserve special emphasis to insure that:

- the Spanish-speaking are aware of program services available to them, and
- manpower program administrators are aware of the needs of the Spanish-speaking and how best to serve them.

B. Strengthening Mainstream Manpower Programs

Recommendations in the following major areas, taken together with the approach outlined above, add up to a comprehensive and interrelated strategy to build upon the Department's present efforts to improve the delivery of manpower services to Spanish-speaking Americans and to make them far more effective:

1. Policy and Goals

The following points would provide the basis for manpower policy formulation and the setting of manpower goals for persons of Spanish origin over the next decade:

- The Federal government should assume a leadership role in enunciating national manpower policy and goals for the Spanish-speaking. The expenditure of all Federal manpower funds (including any under special revenue sharing) would be in accordance with these goals whether operating responsibility for the program is at the Federal, state or local level.

- Specific plans setting forth goals and performance objectives should be required of all program administrators with a requirement for accountability through program progress reports, monitoring, evaluation, and participation of advisory groups, including substantial representation of members of the persons and groups to be served.

- *Parity is the basic principle on which manpower policy for the Spanish-speaking and other racial/ethnic groups should rest. Parity means that the goal of program management should be to provide each segment of the target community served with a share of program benefits measured in terms of enrollments as well as intended program outcomes (e.g., placement rates, starting wages, job retention, career opportunity) and equivalent to its proportion of the target population, taking also into account relative need. An operational approach to parity and relative need is outlined below.*

- First priority on use of additional program funds, or any basic changes in program design or target group participation, should be to move programs toward parity.

- The Administration should indicate at the highest level of policy making priority to be given disadvantaged persons of Spanish-origin in efforts to move toward parity since this is a major target group denied the benefits of equitable participation in manpower programs.

While the focus of this report is on the implications of a policy of parity for the Spanish-speaking, we believe that manpower policy should be focused on the needs of all disadvantaged and minority groups. Accordingly, we recommend that the Department undertake to staff out the application of the parity concept to other groups, including Negroes, American Indians, and Appalachian whites. The approach to parity for the Spanish-speaking set forth in this report is in no sense designed to result in inequity for other disadvantaged persons.

The following steps could lead to enunciating a priority statement by the Administration for the manpower policy and goals for the Spanish-speaking:

- Assign responsibility (e.g., to the Assistant Secretary for Policy Evaluation and Research) for staffing out a position paper setting forth a policy of parity in the administration of manpower programs and indicating priority for persons of Spanish origin.
- Speeches from the President and other key Administration officials should dramatize this policy initiative.
- An inter-agency task force under White House or OMB leadership should be convened to outline the elements of an inter-agency Action Plan to implement these policies.

- Assign responsibility within DOL for developing and implementing plans.
- Provide for high level involvement of persons of Spanish origin in advising on these plans (e.g., the Cabinet Committee on Spanish-speaking Americans; Spanish-speaking manpower specialists).

Hard choices must be made in determining what constitutes a "fair share" or parity. It is not enough to set a target for participation equivalent to the proportion the group makes up of the total population as this ignores relative need. It would be no more reasonable to consider 5 percent a target for the Spanish-speaking since that is their proportion of the total U.S. population (exclusive of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) than it would be to peg Negroes at 11 percent of manpower programs based on the isolated fact that there are 22.6 million Negroes. Relative need, not numbers alone, should be the principal consideration for a responsible manpower policy.

At a minimum, presumably, program participation, success ratios, and dollar expenditures should conform to relative indices of need. These should be based on a combination of such factors as income, unemployment rates, occupational status, education, etc. Such objective quantitative standards suggest the need for higher priority and more resources to persons of Spanish origin. Also, when program services are targeted primarily or exclusively on minority groups, as generally is the case in urban-based manpower programs, parity indices should be based on the relative needs of the ethnic groups affected.

A principal value in the development of a set of parity "formulas" based on relative need is that they would constitute a set of tools for making the essential management decisions in connection with goal setting and resource allocation. Program Administrators would be compelled to think through, and make explicit, those factors essential to success in designing and carrying out programs that will lead to equal opportunity for Spanish-speaking Americans.

> *The Department should develop a policy of parity that will serve as a guide to near-term resource allocation and program design decisions that give priority to Spanish-speaking Americans in closing the parity gap which has developed over many generations, but without causing inequity for other minority groups and disadvantaged persons.*

This calls for a high order of analysis. It also requires access to some of the qualitative data on program results and enrollee characteristics that had not yet been fully processed by the Manpower Administration at the end of our study.

However, the basic factors that need to be included in a parity "formula" can be readily identified, and their fundamental relationships sketched out. Detailed numerical values and relative weighting of factors (and possibly some refinement of the factors themselves) call for analysis that could take several weeks to complete. Furthermore, there will need to be several formulas that produce goals for program participation, success rates, allocation of funds, staff participation, etc. Parity measures of success rates in terms of outcomes for enrollees (e.g., placement rates, starting wages, job retention, career upgrading) are clearly more crucial than those that measure program enrollments. In addition to national applications of the formulas, they may need to be applied at regional, state and local levels (since the national parity goal has operational relevance only through a planning and management system that takes into account the relative needs of the target groups at the individual community level.

> *The discussion of parity included herein is intended to illustrate the parity concept and how it might be operationalized to serve as a guide to the Department in subsequent development of the parity measures that would be used in actual practice.*

Certain basic factors underlie the development of parity formulas as goal-setting and resource allocation tools. First, these management tools are designed to implement national priorities in the allocation of manpower funds and in no instance would they run contrary to the desired manpower policy. Such tools would need to be applied separately to separate and distinct program thrusts growing out of national priorities. Accordingly, the population which appropriately serves as the base for parity goal-setting and resource allocation within urban manpower programs is the urban poor. Likewise, the population which should serve as the base for parity formulas affecting goals and resource allocation within rural manpower programs is the rural poor. Since the Spanish-speaking constitute a far greater proportion of the urban than rural poor, they are entitled under this concept to a greater share of the benefits of urban than rural manpower investments. Precisely what share of the benefits should be theirs in either case depends upon their proportion of the total who live in either urban or rural poverty. Since the Department's manpower resources are concentrated largely in the cities and since roughly

80 percent of the Spanish-speaking population lives in urban areas, the parity discussion and examples emphasize these areas.*

Second, if parity formulas are to be used effectively as management tools, it is essential that they focus clearly on the chief concerns of management in attaining the goals and objectives of manpower programs. To strive primarily, for example, for equitable enrollment of the Spanish-speaking in the manpower programs available to them would not provide the best measure of management success -- as the central purpose of manpower programs, and their real management challenge, does not lie in the enrollment of eligible people. The purpose of manpower programs is to prepare people and jobs for each other, and to place people in good jobs paying decent wages and offering career opportunities. It is on these measures, plus the telling measure of job retention rates, that the Spanish-speaking are entitled to parity with the other disadvantaged groups.

Moreover, focusing on these most relevant ideces of program benefits puts resource allocation and results in proper relative on to program goals. Once the goals are set -- program by program -- in the manner set forth above, resources need to be allocated on a "whatever it takes" basis (within the framework of what is available) to make steady progress towards goal achievement. If a particular program approach fails to yield the anticipated program results for Spanish-speaking enrollees in terms of their needs and in comparison with outcomes for other groups, it is necessary to either apply more resources or to modify or abandon the approach in favor of another.

---

*This in no sense is intended to minimize the importance of developing parity measures appropriate to rural areas. Moreover, other recommendations in this report bear directly on the needs of Spanish-speaking Americans in rural areas (e.g., migrants).

Until the Department's data are routinely available and organized by managers to indicate how manpower programs have performed for the Spanish-speaking against such a set of parity-influenced goals, it is necessary to continue to rely on the considered judgments of respondents in the field, supported by such case studies and data as can be obtained. This leads to the conclusion that much needs to be done to achieve parity in manpower for the Spanish-speaking.

In large measure, the Department is in the urban manpower business. As for any other manager, it is simply good business to adopt an explicit policy requiring goal-setting based on parity expressed in terms of benefits and outcomes for Spanish-speaking persons, measuring performance in terms of such quantified standards.

Such a policy and measures should take into account the manpower needs of the Spanish-speaking, relative to other disadvantaged groups. Since the Department's data regarding program outcomes had not been made available as of this writing, official (MMDS) data showing program participation is used to illustrate how the Department might develop a parity formula for Spanish-speaking participation in urban programs. Participation levels reflect a minimum application of parity, since it is necessary to at least get in the program to have any hope of success.

The basic factors underlying the parity concept in program participation are:

(A) Spanish-speaking percentage of the urban disadvantaged population (17% on the Social Security Administration's standard poverty index)*

(B) Other relative need factors (e.g., language, cultural barriers, educational deprivation)

(C) Spanish-speaking percentage of total program participants

$$\frac{C}{A+B} = \text{Parity Index}$$

Attainment of parity is reflected by an index number of 1. The lower the index number, the further the program is from parity.

Since the factors cited in B are known to be those in which the Spanish-speaking are relatively worse off than other groups (there may be other factors of relative need in which this relationship does not hold true, but it seemed to be generally the case for those considered in Chapter I), the poverty index factor A could be used alone as a "proxy" for A+B until the values of B could be computed. This, of course, would have the effect of somewhat overstating the extent to which the program approaches parity.

---

*No figures are published by the Bureau of Census on the numbers of Spanish-speaking poor in urban areas. The March 1971 sample census estimates that persons of Spanish origin make up about 9 percent of the low-income population nationwide. Using the best available data, we estimate that one out of six low-income persons in urban areas are Spanish-speaking, a result of the high concentration of that group in the cities. This 17% estimate is used in the parity discussion for illustrative purposes only.

Applying this simplified formula to a couple of the examples cited earlier in the report of Spanish-speaking program participation in MDTA/OJT, NAB/JOBS, and WIN* could be done as follows:

(1) MDTA/OJT = 8% Spanish-speaking participants

$$\frac{.08}{.17} = .47 \text{ parity index}$$

(2) NAB/JOBS = 13% Spanish-speaking participants

$$\frac{.13}{.17} = .76 \text{ parity index}$$

(3) WIN = 20% Spanish-speaking participants

$$\frac{.20}{.17} = 1.17 \text{ parity index}$$

MDTA/OJT and NAB/JOBS show participation below parity (which is consistent with the data obtained in the 20 communities visited during the study). WIN has shown substantial success in reaching the Spanish-speaking (and the program's focus on welfare recipients means that the extreme poverty of the Spanish-speaking may make them somewhat more likely to be included).

---

[*] We assume that the urban concentration of enrollees in these programs remains much as in FY 1970 (MDTA/OJT, 81%; NAB/JOBS, 100%; WIN, 80%, as reported in the Manpower Report of the President, 1971).

In all these cases, of course, it would be necessary to look at success rates before drawing far-reaching conclusions based on participation levels alone.

The above is presented as illustrative of how one might go about developing an operationally useful parity concept. The key to the approach is identifying the relevant factors and variables. Much could be written about applications of parity in planning and program management. Some of the basic principles and data requirements are set forth elsewhere in this report (e.g., in the presentation of strategic planning). Others are outside the scope of the present study but can be developed based on management experience in quantifying goals and focusing organizational effort on results measured in terms of those goals.

2. Strategic Manpower Planning

In any decision to proceed to decentralize manpower programs, DOL should issue guidance and provide extensive technical assistance on how to carry out results-oriented strategic planning centered on enrollee needs and available jobs. Standards for program "success" should be promulgated based on such factors as enhanced employability, job placement and retention, and career upgrading rather than simply numbers of enrollees exposed to a certain amount of training. Information systems at national, state and local levels should be redesigned to permit a meaningful evaluation of program accomplishments and to show the extent to which various segments of the target population -- including racial-ethnic groups -- are benefiting from services. CAMPS, or its successor planning system, should be strengthened to control the allocation of resources subject to final decisions of the prime sponsor. Target group members, including significant representation of the Spanish-speaking in communities of high concentration, should play a clearly prescribed and meaningful role on the advisory board.

In view of the importance of this issue, the need to go into considerable detail to convey exactly what is proposed, and the importance of local planning in implementing many aspects of the Action Plan, Chapter IV is devoted to a detailed outline of such a planning system.

In the event of a decision not to further decentralize manpower planning and operational responsibilities, many of the basic principles outlined could be incorporated in the present planning system to great advantage -- particularly a data system that highlights Spanish-speaking Americans.

3. Public Employment

A five-year crash program should be developed to broaden public sector employment for the Spanish-speaking. A first goal should be to move the proportion of Spanish-speaking employees in the total full-time Federal civilian work force to at least their proportion of the total population, which means roughly doubling their participation (according to 1970 figures it was 2.9 percent, an increase of only .1 percentage point over 1969).

Second, a multi-faceted program to encourage state and local government to employ the Spanish-speaking, with the Employment Service in particular required to achieve parity. Third, special efforts should be made to include persons of Spanish origin in Public Service Careers and other public employment programs.

The recently enacted Emergency Employment Act of 1971 can be used as a first step in this effort. Plans and guidelines should be developed to encourage the employment of Spanish-speaking persons.

4. Eliminating Discrimination and Barriers to Employment

First, an intensive interagency effort, involving particularly DOL and EEOC, must be mounted to strengthen the enforcement of present legislation designed to eliminate discriminatory practices of private employers and unions, emphasizing a "class action" strategy rather than individual charges. Second, cooperation of the National Alliance of Business (NAB) should be sought to initiate a "marketing" strategy to sensitize the business community to the Spanish-speaking; to develop model personnel management programs; to strengthen the NAB/JOBS contract; and to demonstrate planned variations of a bilingual-bicultural training package. Third, the AFL/CIO should be asked to undertake a major effort to broaden the union participation of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other persons of Spanish origins.

a. EEOC. DOL cooperation in enforcement actions with EEOC should focus on four major areas:

- Priority to "class action" suits to end widespread systems of discrimination rather than simply dealing with individual complaints
- Coordination of Federal contract compliance strategies with EEOC
- Efforts to develop model personnel management systems
- Testing systems that do not discriminate against the Spanish-speaking should be developed and promulgated

b. National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB). DOL should seek the active participation of NAB in a two-pronged effort to eliminate discrimination and barriers to employment in the private sector. First, a series of actions designed to heighten the awareness of the business leadership of the needs of Spanish-speaking Americans and steps that they can take in responding to those needs more effectively -- in effect a "marketing" strategy. Second, steps to strengthen the involvement of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other persons of Spanish origin in the NAB/JOBS program.

At present, roughly 11-13 percent of the participants in NAB/JOBS are Spanish-speaking, well below parity. No special efforts have been made to target services on this group, although a few employers, on their own initiative, have made promising efforts in this direction. No guidance has been developed by DOL or NAB on program services to the Spanish-speaking. Commonly, where there are efforts to focus special services on the disadvantaged, they are aimed at Negroes and often the programs are run by Negroes. Since the essential thrust of such programs is focused on building the individual's sense of self-worth, identity and pride, it is clear that materials and approaches that are very successful with Negroes can be counterproductive in the eyes of the Spanish-speaking.

One of the most serious problems found was the attitudes of supervisors toward the Spanish-speaking. Of the ten NAB/JOBS employers visited by the Study Group only one, Singer-Friden, Inc., in Albuquerque, had a satisfactory supervisory training program. In this case, it was made clear to the supervisors that they were responsible for training and retention of the work force (61 of 111 disadvantaged enrollees are currently on board and 12 of the 15 leadmen in this electronics plant are former CEP enrollees). In general, there appeared to be a fairly direct correlation between the efforts of top management to impress upon middle management and foremen the priority given the program and what is expected of them and retention rates of enrollees. One program we saw where there was absolutely no effort made to affect the supervisors resulted in 100 percent loss of enrollees within a few weeks. In many cases, the factors generating friction are rooted in ordinary human behavior and could be easily handled. A common concern of Anglo supervisors and fellow employees, for example, when two workers are speaking Spanish together, is that they must be talking about them.

Another major difficulty is that NAB/JOBS is primarily dependent for referral of disadvantaged enrollees on ES and CEP. Neither institution is a fully satisfactory channel. ES, despite impressive strides in recent years in attempting to give greater priority to the disadvantaged, has not yet developed effective outreach to the Spanish-speaking community. As for CEP, except in those few places where there is a preponderance of Chicanos and they exert substantial political influence in the community, target areas leave out the Spanish speaking. For example, Chrysler executives have complained that they would like to involve more Spanish-speaking in Detroit but are unable to find the enrollees. The Detroit CEP target area covers only about 1 percent of the estimated 60,000 Spanish-speaking Americans in the metropolitan area. Neither the outreach service center nor the recruiting components have bilingual personnel. Spanish-speaking community groups, on a voluntary basis receiving no DOL funds, are the primary source of what little recruitment does take place. It is small wonder that the auto industry has difficulty achieving its goal of fuller involvement of persons of Spanish origin.

Unfortunately, many business leaders are not yet aware of the numbers or need of the Spanish-speaking or of the economic potential of this group if they gain access to better jobs. DOL should seek the cooperation of NAB in utilizing the organization's public relations capability to launch a major "marketing" strategy to make business leadership more aware of Spanish-speaking Americans. Activities in this area might include:

- Gaining the commitment of company presidents to hiring disadvantaged Spanish-speaking Americans, with goals set moving toward parity.

- Developing executive seminars to discuss how to mobilize the firm to carry out the commitment from top management; how to cope with resistance to change expected from personnel departments, line supervisors and the regular work force; and how to work with manpower and education agencies and Spanish-speaking groups in community planning to develop viable programs that serve all disadvantaged persons.

- Strengthening the firm's Affirmative Action Plan efforts by carrying out a total review and modification of the personnel system (recruitment, hiring, wages and salaries, promotion policies, supervision, etc.) as it affects the Spanish-speaking.

A second area in which NAB could make a significant contribution is through modification in the NAB/JOBS Contract and a series of parallel implementation steps. The need to strengthen contract arrangements is summed up in the complaint of one employer: "I negotiate the JOBS '70 contract representing the company's interest, the Contract Service Representative negotiates to protect the government's dollar -- who negotiates for the people I'm going to hire?"

The following steps should be taken:

- Place greater priority on supportive services (counseling, coaching, etc.)

- Develop guidelines to facilitate manpower programs with extensive experience with the Spanish-speaking providing supportive services to employers within the terms of the contract.

- Create model supervisory training programs, emphasizing seminar techniques which allow for discussion interchange among participants aimed at understanding how to deal with Spanish-speaking workers. Such training should begin prior to bringing new staff on board and take place periodically during the first few months of experience with new employees.

- Provide incentives to employers for retention of enrollees (say a 5% bonus for 75% retention over 6 months).

- Develop criteria for exemplary program performance and give out public awards to outstanding employers.

- Reorient training to the accomplishment of certain job related objectives rather than just require so many weeks of training. Give the enrollee what he needs for job success.

- Develop model bilingual-bicultural training packages through experimental contracts (some employers conduct shorter training programs for the Spanish-speaking than for some other disadvantaged groups because they lack relevant training materials).

- Provide special language training grants for the estimated 2/3 of NAB/JOBS enrollees of Spanish origin who have language problems.

- Extend the amount of authorized English as a Second Language (ESL) training. In New York City, for example, NAB/JOBS estimates that over 400 hours of job related education is required.

- Mount research programs to define with greater precision the effectiveness of ESL and other bilingual-bicultural program approaches in terms of equipping the enrollee with the necessary job skills to foster retention and upgrading.

- Work with the U. S. Office of Education to involve universities and community colleges in outreach programs to assist in providing the necessary training (e.g., New York University has expressed an interest in this area).

- Provide partial subsidies for apprenticeship programs now paid by unions and management to incentivize training of the disadvantaged.

- Utilize NAB/JOBS experience in community manpower planning to better program government subsidized contracts with local manpower program input/output and to relate training provided to available jobs for which enrollees have reasonable prospects for employment.

- Clarify what training needs to be provided before enrollees are entitled to a pay raise.

- Upgrade or hire Spanish-speaking in key supervisory positions (however, one should not assume that this automatically leads to good supervisor-worker relations -- many Spanish-speaking supervisors also require training in this area, and employers should be especially alert to cultural tensions within the Spanish-speaking community as may sometimes arise when a Cuban is placed over Puerto Ricans).

- Encourage situations where the employer representative who writes the NAB/JOBS contract also has responsibility for monitoring results.
- Arrange for big firms that have had successful NAB/JOBS programs to work with smaller firms and provide them the benefit of their experience.
- Broaden NAB/JOBS arrangements to offset national or local economic downturns.
- In communities where ES, CEP or other referral systems are not including the Spanish-speaking on a basis of parity, set up a special outreach mechanism.
- Develop more flexible guidelines for negotiating costs with employers to facilitate the above activities.
- Modify reporting procedures on program participants to provide more meaningful characteristics information and results-oriented data for Spanish-speaking Americans.

c. Unions. Statistics on minority union membership for 1969 released by EEOC in February 1971, show that with 2.5 million members, 6.7 percent were Spanish-surnamed and 9.2 percent were Negro. Figures for building trades were 5.1 percent and 6.8 percent, respectively.

Analysis of the data shows not only a persistence of patterns of discrimination barring union membership but a concentration at the lower end of the wage scale.

DOL should seek the active involvement of the AFL/CIO on behalf of disadvantaged Spanish-speaking Americans in the following areas:

- Broadening union membership
- Apprenticeship programs

- Quota systems along the lines of the Chicago Plan, but with better implementation and safeguards to insure that the Spanish-speaking are included.
- Jointly funded efforts between unions and Spanish-speaking organizations to couple training, counseling, and other program components.

5. Other Program Activities

Other areas in which DOL could take action to benefit particular groups of Spanish-speaking Americans include:

a. Women. Special steps should be undertaken by DOL to respond to the weak economic position of Spanish-speaking women. These activities should include:

- Development of better statistics on the role of women in the labor force
- Assistance in securing positions in the public service (e.g., under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971)
- Development of child care services
- Career upgrading programs

b. Youth. The needs of Spanish-speaking youth parallel those of many disadvantaged youth in terms of high unemployment rates, school drop outs, and adjustment problems. In many cases beyond the needs of other youth, the Spanish-speaking youth face the language problem, culture differences, problems brought on by family and the change in values, and the emerging militancy of Spanish-speaking youth.

The drug and arrest problem is particularly high. DOL should stimulate the development of an interagency plan to deal with Spanish-speaking youth.

That plan should include the following:

- That NYC, Job Corps and other programs designed for youth require a bilingual and bicultural counselor to meet with the parents to discuss the program and to assure that the parents fully understand development of the youth involved.
- That follow-up procedures be adhered to in order to determine the effect of these programs on Spanish-speaking youth.
- Spanish-speaking counselor should be available.
- The counseling approach should change to consider the total needs of the counselee first.
- There should be a wide study of available jobs and job opportunity which can be related to the various training and work experience programs.
- Special vocational and training programs should be developed for Spanish-speaking youth that are detained. These could include positons under PSC in the areas of Education, Corrections, Health, Conservation, Welfare and other.
- Flexibility between programs should be provided in order to facilitate the movement between programs to the advantage of the youth.

- Determination criteria should be adjusted in such a manner so as to take into account the cost of living index for any particular area. It should also consider family size, education, and other key sociological aspects, including arrest records. Special review of the arrests should be made and consideration given where facts indicate.

- There should be a joint program developed by DOL and OE to provide work pegged education for Spanish-speaking youth that can be articulated toward ABE.

- NYC program should be sponsored by Spanish-speaking organizations in areas where Spanish-speaking youth are in significant concentration.

- Programs should be developed jointly with HEW, OEO, and Department of Justice for potential drug user, for potential offender, for drug users, for offender and for Spanish-speaking youths on probation. There are some examples of these, including the Vera Institute model, the self-study model, the RODEO model and others.

- Outreach services for Spanish-speaking youth, staffed by persons whom the Spanish-speaking youth can relate to should be developed as a regular part of ES and other manpower training efforts.

- The ES should be required to provide vocational counseling to every Spanish-speaking youth that drops out as soon as that is reported by the school system. Special efforts to enroll the Spanish-speaking youth in work related education should be made.

- All youth not in school over the age of 16 should be encouraged to register for work and those not employed or employable be counted in the unemployment rate. Then they should be eligible for employment under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.
- Present programs and those to be designed should include components that highlight cultural values. Exposure should also be provided to the contribution of other cultures.
- In the present work experience program and those that are developed better slots should be created. These slots should provide meaningful experience to the youth and to the agency. They should, whenever possible be accredited by an educational institution and should provide skills that may be utilized on future jobs.
- DOL and all State ES should hire staff that are bilingual and bicultural and that are sensitive, knowledgeable and aware of the many problems of Spanish-speaking youth.

c. Veterans. Spanish-speaking veterans should be included in priority programs being initiated. Guidelines should be developed for this purpose. The assistance of Spanish-speaking organizations (e.g., the American G.I. Forum) should be sought.

d. Migrants. The continuing extensive underemployment, unemployment and resulting extreme poverty in the homebase area is a root cause for migrancy. As a result migrant workers with limited education and few marketable skills are forced into the migrant stream each year to earn their livelihood. The family members travel with the migrant family head both because of the desire for family solidarity and because low wages force entire families to work. Migrants have little opportunity to secure job training or other manpower services which would help them to secure permanent employment either in the home base area or at more highly industrialized areas.

The Study Group gave comparatively little attention to migrants since another DOL Task Force was working on this issue, resulting in the recent approval of a $20 million program for migrants. Also the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-speaking recently developed a Task Force report on this issue.

We propose the following recommendations be considered in connection with those other reports:

- Redirect the Farm Labor Service orientation in State Employment offices to aid the migrant directly, through coordination with other program services.
- Focus Federal funds into migrant home base areas in order to develop multiple service operations through a cooperative effort among the DOL and all other Federal agencies. A vehicle for this approach could be the Regional Councils.
- Special remedial and basic education, skill training and manpower programs should be scheduled to coincide with the return of migrants to their home base areas. A specific number of slots should be reserved for migrants at MDTA, CEP and other manpower projects in home base and in settling-out areas. Program design should reflect the fact that migrants have been disadvantaged educationally as well as economically and

that larger periods of enrollment as well as special supportive services are necessary. Training should also include skills useful in employment in the mechanized farming techniques of agri-business.

- That local, state, regional and national advisory boards composed of migrants and community people be established to aid in program development, determination of priorities, and assistance in strategic planning at each appropriate level.

- Regulations should be amended to permit the Employment Service to establish a system to certify growers as eligible for farm labor recruitment assistance. Such growers must meet established standards of housing, wages and working conditions and have no recent record of abuse of migrants.

- NYC regulations should permit an NYC trainee at the migrant home base to continue his NYC connection at the new location of his parents. This could possibly provide enough money so that the enrollee could stay in school rather than being forced to work to help support the family. An additional approach would involve planning a project for a particular migratory route followed by migrant families from one locality. Substations would be established along the way, the NYC enrollee would be expected, his local program planned in advance, and there would be a continuity of work experience.

9.

- In order to move towards more tolerable living and working conditions, a model should be established under the pattern of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico farm labor contracts and all migrant labor in the United States should be conducted under such contracts.

e. Border Crossers. Serious economic hardship is caused Mexican Americans along Southwest border areas as a result of being forced to compete with low-wage commuters from Mexico. Other ways should be found to promote this country's important international relations objectives of good relations with Mexico that do not penalize American citizens. Priority should be given to resident Spanish-speaking Americans in access to the Employment Service and other manpower programs. Other incentives for employers in the area to utilize resident Chicanos should be developed.

f. Opportunities for Families Program. The Opportunities for Families Program, currently being designed by the Department in response to welfare reform legislation that has passed the House (H.R.1), will have as its goal to move the maximum number of individuals and families from the welfare rolls to self-supporting employment. Several fundamental program design factors should be scrutinized for their potential effects on the Spanish-speaking (and most particularly the Mexican American and Puerto Rican cultures -- as subcultures within the culture of poverty).

The following OFP program considerations warrant careful study in light of the particular needs of the Spanish-speaking:

- the program is conceived around income strategies which affect the whole family; the intent is to reinforce the family unit by focusing on family income and family employability, leading in part to emphasis on the training and placement of wives and other secondary wage earners. Inclusion of NYC as a resource in such a strategy, on the other hand, poses fewer problems and would appear to be a natural fit with the recommendations elsewhere in this report regarding that program's involvement of Spanish-speaking youth. Secondary wage earner strategies should designed bearing in mind the reaction of the Spanish-speaking community to other manpower programs that they believe have contributed to undermining the traditional role of the male head of family by placing the wife in what is perceived to be higher status employment.

- child care will be provided in order to free mothers to work; questions of adequacy of care, and what role the mother has in making that determination, should take into account the strong family ties and special role of the women as wife and mother which characterize the Spanish-speaking culture.

- work requirements which grow out of cultural assumptions regarding the "work ethic" must be tailored to the "different" work ethic attributed by some studies to the Spanish-speaking (work is generally held to be a means to an end rather than an end in itself). Careful analysis is called for to determine what differences exist in fact, and what is the best approach to achieve the aims of the legislation.

- cost-effective allocation of resources in response to nationally set goals and priorities should reflect considerations of racial/ethnic balance based on relative need* and the probability that special bilingual-bicultural program services responding to unique needs of the Spanish-speaking will be somewhat more costly than for other groups (at least initially).

Liaison with the Welfare Reform Planning Staff, which has Department-wide responsibility for H.R.1 contingency planning, should be established by the Manpower Administration's Special Program Development Division for purposes of providing ongoing advice on the unique needs of the Spanish-speaking in these and other program design efforts.

---

*See the discussion of parity above.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Secretary of Labor should take the following steps to bring about successful implementation of the Action Plan:

- Assign high-level implementation responsibility
- Carry out a review of the Implementation Plan below, make appropriate adjustments, develop a formal action schedule with controls and reporting dates
- Have Regional Offices develop plans spelling out how they will target services on Spanish-speaking Americans (these could be modeled on the excellent plan developed by the Boston Regional Office -- the only region to take such action)
- Develop guidelines for state and local follow-up, perhaps on the planning framework discussed in Chapter IV.

* * * * *

SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION STEPS (KEYED TO ACTION PLAN)

Section A: Building the Long-Run Capability to Serve the Spanish-speaking Effectively

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PROGRAMS AND APPROACHES • Assess current projects researching various approaches. • Develop flexible institutional linkages enabling school systems and manpower agencies to waive MDTA guidelines inhibiting effective training of Spanish-speaking Americans. • Develop innovative curricula. • Provide broad-based TA to programs, instructors, counselors and other staff.	1. Initiate CCOS development of a three year plan for bilingual/bicultural manpower design with inputs from OE, OEO, DOL.
	2. Evaluate current projects for effectiveness, impact and broader applicability, including: • SER monolingual effort • Puerto Rican Forum BOLT project • OEO migrant programs • Boston Spanish-Speaking Skills Center • SW Educational Research Lab (Albuq.)
	3. Identify what other key approach elements need to be researched.
	4. Prepare approach and methodology summaries and curriculum guidelines for dissemination to local programs.
	5. Recommend DOL/HEW task force be convened to determine in what ways MDTA or other guidelines need to be waived to clear path for broader use of special approaches; propose waiver or revisio of guidelines.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PROGRAMS AND APPROACHES (Con't)	6. Earmark funds and select specific programs and cities for priority expansion of effective special approaches.
	7. Provide (or contract for) TA to local programs for implementation of new approaches.
	8. Earmark FY1973-4 funds based on interim assessment of plans and progress.
	9. Impact evaluation of new bilingual/bicultural approaches on Spanish-speaking Americans.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION • Develop R&D Plan for Spanish-Speaking Americans. • Fund Spanish-speaking and other manpower groups to carry out R&D activities.	1. Prepare position paper on R & D and Spanish speaking Americans and forward to OPER.
	2. Develop priority guidelines for funding Spanish Speaking American manpower groups for R & D.
	3. Draft R & D Plan for Spanish Speaking Americans (perhaps as inputs to overall R&D Plan). Plan should address both R&D projects directed primarily or exclusively at Spanish Speaking Americans as well as all major R&D efforts in terms of how special needs of Spanish Speaking Americans will be addressed.
	4. Coordinate R & D Plan with other agencies.
	5. Prepare RFPs for selected FY 1972 projects and earmark funds.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
• LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT • Mount comprehensive program to upgrade Spanish-speaking American leadership • Appoint 50 additional Spanish-speaking Americans to GS-16 and above Federal executive positions over next two years • DOL/OE efforts to promote dramatic increase in Spanish-speaking Americans students in higher education over next five years.	1. Develop position paper on Spanish-speaking American leadership development and its relation to manpower.
	2. Convene interagency task force to formulate a comprehensive plan utilizing such approaches as: • Intergovernmental Personnel Act to transfer Spanish-speaking Americans (and others) between ES, DOL, CAAs, Model Cities, MDTA Skills Centers, Local Manpower Coordination Offices, etc., in a structured program of career development • Creation of a special Manpower Fellows Program along the above lines • Working with the Leadership Institute for Career Development (LICD) in evolving and carrying out training approaches for Spanish-speaking Americans in manpower

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT **(Con't)**	3. Work with White House and CSC to identify key supergrade positions in DOL to give priority in recruitment and upgrading of Spanish-speaking Americans. CSC to institute and monitor such a system for other agencies against the goal. Use executive search firms if CCOSS and standard agency approaches don't turn up "suitable" candidates. Training and career development of identified Spanish-speaking American "comers" in GS-13,14,15 slots should be a primary recruiting source using techniques such as those practiced by IRS.
	4. Develop plan with OE to increase students in higher education to further SSA manpower leadership, upgrading efforts. The plan might include such steps as: • Linking community colleges and manpower agencies around structured plans and incentives for staff and enrollee continuing education • Linking talent search programs (eg,SER) directly to manpower through special summer work opportunities • Developing Upward Bound components tied to manpower • Creating an educational readiness testing program in cooperation with CEPs, CAAs, ES, etc. to identify manpower clients with college potential (assuming special language and other support is provided) and provide pre-college preparation, and counseling, loans and stipends.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
WORKING WITH SPECIAL PURPOSE SPANISH-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS • Increase funding support to manpower organizations run by Spanish-speaking Americans groups. • Broaden training and technical assistance (T&TA) to Spanish-speaking Americans groups to: -- make them more effective -- use them to assist ES and other manpower agencies to become more responsive • Fund special purpose Spanish-speaking Americans groups (e.g., the National Spanish-Speaking Manpower Organization, recently funded by OEO) to broaden the state of the art in how to deliver manpower services to Spanish-speaking Americans. • Broaden public information activities affecting Spanish-speaking Americans.	1. Complete Directory of Spanish-speaking Americans Manpower Organizations begun by Study Group.
	2. Analyze the capability of those groups (there are over 100) to expand operations and broaden services to Spanish-speaking Americans. Project on a case by case basis, whether more and better services will be provided Spanish-speaking Americans by additional funds to Spanish-speaking Americans groups or other agencies in the community over a 5-year period.
	3. Earmark funds for those Spanish-speaking Americans groups showing the most c promise (relying on the principles of performance contracting and incentive funding), taking account the needs of Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and other subgroups as well as communities of high concentration.
	4. Develop T&TA Plan for Spanish-speaking Americans highlighting: • Provision of management assistance to Spanish-speaking Americans groups that receive earmarked funds (along the lines of that provided SER) • Expansion of T&TA to migrant programs of Division of Rural Manpower • Use of Spanish-speaking Americans groups to provide T&TA and to play an advisory role during planning to ES and other major manpower agencies • Use and development of Spanish-speaking Americans consulting firms and other T&TA contractors (use SBA minority preference, organize training conferences for minority consultants, team minority contractors with other experienced firms, etc.)
	5. Earmark funds for T&TA.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
WORKING WITH SPECIAL PURPOSE SPANISH-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS (Con't)	6. Carry out analysis of the capability of existing Spanish-speaking American groups to expand the state of the art in how to serve Spanish-speaking Americans (building on the framework with Study Group working paper on the National Spanish-Speaking Manpower Organization dated April 30, 1971) specifying outcomes keyed to needs identified in TLA Final Report.
	7. Develop a plan to create additional Spanish-speaking Americans groups, if needed, in such areas as planning, program development, research, evaluation and T&TA in those cases where over a five year period there is a reasonable probability that an ethnic group can make a major contribution (considering such options as the UCLA model in carrying out the Mexican-American Study Project of using a Chicano as Co-Director). In some cases, the cooperation of other agencies (e.g., OEO, EEOC, OE) may be sought in actually forming a new group.
	8. Prepare RFPs to implement plan; earmark FY 1973 funds for funding selected organizations.
	9. Convene working conference of Spanish-speaking American manpower specialists to assess Institution Building strategy and other aspects of how to improve services (informal consultation should take place on an on-going basis during implementation of all key action steps)
	10. Carry out multi-year evaluation of Institution Building.

ACTION		NEXT STEPS
WORKING WITH SPECIAL PURPOSE SPANISH-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS (Con't)	11.	Assess present DOL public information efforts on behalf of Spanish-speaking Americans to determine what steps need to be taken to: • Make Spanish-speaking Americans aware of manpower opportunities potentially available • Inform manpower administrators, other agencies and the general public of special needs of Spanish-speaking Americans

SECTION B: Strengthening Mainstream Manpower Programs

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
POLICY AND GOALS • Enunciate policy on parity with priority for Spanish-speaking Americans • Insure that future resource allocations move toward parity • Make policy public	1. Develop parity performance standards and measurements in terms of funding, headcount and all standard DOL success indicators.
	2. Issue Departmental order on parity governing program funding, staffing and participation.
	3. Input to planning and budget guidance to the field.
	4. Revise reporting and control systems to include parity expenditures and program participation rates of Spanish speaking Americans.
	5. Revise evaluation systems to incorporate performance standards and measurements in step 1.
	6. Quantitative progress in moving toward parity in Manpower Report of the President in terms of headcount and funding all major reporting tables should show Spanish-speaking Americans and non-Spanish-speaking Americans.
	7. Recommend Interagency Task Force to White House.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
STRATEGIC MANPOWER PLANNING • Redefine CAMPS role to include comprehensive resource allocation recommendations to single prime sponsor at local and state levels. • Stipulate role of Spanish-speaking Americans on CAMPS advisory boards. NOTE: DETAILED AND INTERRELATED RECOMMENDATIONS SPELLED OUT IN CHAPTER IV OF TLA REPORT, "STRENGTHENING MANPOWER PROGRAMS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING". • Refocus success measures from enrollments and referrals of Spanish-speaking Americans to results achieved for Spanish-speaking Americans. • Issue guidance on results-oriented strategic planning. • Provide technical assistance in strategic planning.	1. Forward Chapter IV of TLA report plus change and action recommendations to OPRA.
	2. Meet with OPRA to discuss progress, problems and issues in reshaping guidelines on CAMPS role as they affect Spanish-speaking Americans.
	3. Issue MAO requiring parity funding, staffing and participation for Spanish-speaking Americans.
	4. Revise reporting and control systems to include parity expenditures, participation, and other standard DOL success measures (see Steps 1 and 4 under POLICY AND GOALS).
	5. Revise standard inputs into contractor statements of work to include strategic planning and parity concepts for TA in local and state planning.
	6. Revise refunding proposal format to include strategic as well as operational plans, and revised reporting systems as in steps 1 and 4, POLICY AND GOALS.
	7. Devise list of areas of high concentrations of Spanish-speaking Americans; disseminate list to RMAs and ONP; monitor allocations of funds to these areas: a) to assess movement toward parity and b) to insure that "underfunded" areas receive priority consideration.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT ● Move Spanish-speaking Americans into Federal civilian work-force in a proportion equal to their proportion in the population within five years. ● Multi-faceted program to encourage state and local governments to employ Spanish-speaking Americans.	1. Recommend goals and timetables for achieving parity in employment by DOL under the President's 16-point plan. Modify 16-point plan as needed to achieve goal within 5 years.
	2. Survey agencies and organizations which specialize (in whole or in part) in placing Spanish-speaking Americans in public employment to determine feasibility of establishing a network coordinated nationwide for public employers and applicants.
	3. Convene a training session for representatives of the 100 leading Spanish-speaking Americans organizations to explain how public employment opportunities are listed, how to apply, what shortcuts may be used, etc. (Focus of opportunities: GS-13 and below, and PSC, New Careers, and other career development programs.)
	4. Compile Spanish-speaking Americans public sector employment statistics compared with (a) parity with Spanish-speaking Americans population nationwide or (b) parity proportion of Spanish-Speaking Americans in target groups, whichever is higher. Recommend timetables and goals for organizations covered under step 2, POLICY AND GOALS, which would affect all public agencies carrying out DOL programs.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT (CONT.)	5. Work with National Civil Service League (and other groups) to: • Tailor efforts to eliminate civil service and other barriers to public employment on special needs of Spanish-speaking Americans • Develop guidance handbook on how state and local government agencies can recruit, train and upgrade Spanish-speaking Americans
	6. Develop programs to expedite ES employment of Spanish-speaking Americans.
	7. Prepare inputs to guidance documents on EEA on involvement of Spanish-speaking Americans

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
DISCRIMINATION AND BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT • Mount an interagency effort to overcome discrimination against Spanish-speaking Americans through a "class action" strategy. • Improve responsiveness of NAB to Spanish-speaking Americans. • Undertake a major effort to broaden union participation of Spanish-speaking Americans.	EEOC 1. Explore with EEOC the strategic implications of new powers under consideration by Congress as they might affect Spanish-speaking Americans.
	2. Develop strategy with EEOC whereby local EEOC and OFCC actions are coordinated so that manpower programs have opportunity to assist employers in violation of EEO laws and regulations to employ and upgrade Spanish-speaking Americans
	3. Develop jointly with EEOC a model personnel system which will serve the ends of both EEOC and employers.
	NAB 1. Send report's recommendations to NAB/JOBS DOL Task Force for review.
	2. Follow up on Task Force review by helping resolve problems and issues emerging from recommendations.
	3. Help NAB select contractor for preparation of training materials to be used by NAB in training supervisors of Spanish-speaking Americans.
	4. Assist NAB to select Spanish-speaking Americans organizations to put in place outreach mechanisms where established programs are failing to achieve parity for Spanish-speaking Americans.
	5. Assist NAB in selecting TA contractors to help employers implement experimental (model) bilingual-bicultural training packages.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
DISCRIMINATION AND BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT CON'T)	**UNIONS**
	1. Work with ONP to ensure they require HRDI to focus clearly on the unique apprenticeship problems of Spanish-speaking Americans.
	2. Recommend ways to HRDI (through ONP) that joint Spanish-speaking Americans organization and Union efforts could improve training, counseling, support services, etc. in apprenticeship programs.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES (CONT.) • Women • Youth • Veterans • Migrants • Border Crossers	Women 1. Prepare an analysis of existing manpower efforts underway to address the specific barriers to economic opportunity to Spanish Speaking American women identified in the report.
	2. Develop plans key to R & D and other parts of the Action Plan to meet the special needs of Spanish Speaking Americans.
	3. Coordinate with other agencies on the plan.
	4. Prepare and disseminate guidance materials to manpower agencies on how to meet the needs of Spanish Speaking American women.
	Youth 1. Prepare an analysis of existing manpower efforts underway to address the specific barriers to economic opportunity to Spanish Speaking American youth identified in the report.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM'ACTIVITIES (CONT.)	2. Develop plans keyed to other parts of the action Plan to meet the special needs of Spanish Speaking American youth.
	3. Coordinate with other agencies on the Plan.
	4. Prepare and disseminate guidance materials to manpower agencies on how to meet the needs of Spanish Speaking American youth.
	Veterans 1. A position paper should be developed on the involvements of Spanish Speaking Americans in the new priority progress for veterans.
	2. Guidance materials and a review checklist (for DOL funding process) should be developed for each manpower program to insure that priority is in fact given to Spanish Speaking veterans.
	3. Specific quantitative goals should be developed and progress monitored showing employment of Spanish Speaking American veterans by various agencies.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES (CONT.)	MIGRANTS 1. Issue guidelines redirecting FLS mission to serve migrants as well as farmers; redesign FLS information system to report as successes migrants (a) helped to find work under working conditions certified as satisfactory under Step 5 below, or (b) helped to successfully settle out of the stream into regular self supporting employment.
	2. Direct RMAs to forward comprehensive inter-agency plans to make permanent improvement in life style of migrant home base areas (e.g. plans for relocation to permanent employment, education to break cycle for the young, economic development of home base area), and to report monthly on progress against plans.
	3. Incorporate into recommendations of Migrant Task Force special bilingual-bicultural education and manpower training approaches which emerge from SPD-sponsored studies in those areas; ensure RMAs implement new approaches in migrant programs.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES **(Con't)**	**4.** Ensure that migrant advisory boards are established and operate effectively at local, state, regional, and national levels in conjunction with current and new migrant manpower and education initiatives.
	5. Develop or follow up on Farm Labor Recruitment Assistance Certification Standards and ensure that reporting and control systems keep track of upgrading of conditions for migrants by farmers, as well as numbers of migrants affected.
	6. Follow up on MA plans to provide mobile NYC programs for individual enrollees, and incentives to continue school rather than work in fields.
	7. Recommend Farm Labor Contract Model based on Puerto Rican contract.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES (CONT.)	BORDER CROSSERS 1. (Pre-OFP) Recommend enforcement of minimum wage laws where "green-carders" paid less than minimum.
	2. Develop RFP to study ways to provide incentives to employers to give priority to resident Chicanos in border areas.
	3. (Post-OFP) See next section.

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
OTHER PROGRAM ACTIVITIES (CONT)	OFP 1. Develop recommendations for WRPS on supplementing income of resident Chicanos in border areas with benefits to extent necessary to allow residents to compete affectively with "Green Carders." 2. Provide liaison with WRPS for these specific purposes: - ensure that parity for Spanish-speaking Americans will be incorporated in OFP policy - Identify opportunities to include Special Spanish-speaking American program models in service component designs - Provide available MA data on Spanish-speaking Americans as needed by WRPS - Prepare RFPs to develop data on Spanish-speaking Americans needed by WRPS - Provide insights into effective approaches, regarding: • income strategies • work ethic/work requirement • child care

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
IMPLEMENTATION • High level official assigned to implementation • Specific action schedules, controls and reporting dates • Regional office implementation plans • Guidelines for local implementation.	1. Issue departmental memorandum distributing Report and assigning action responsibility for various steps as outlined above. It is proposed that the Manpower Administrator personally review the progress in implementation utilizing the Monthly Control Report. The Director OTEO would be designated coordinator of implementation, in charge of monitoring progress against periodic reports prepared by various DOL offices, and would prepare the MCR.
	2. Draft guidance to Regional Offices directing them to prepare implementation plans... Similar to the Region I (Boston) Implementation Plan, which includes guidelines on: • Regional Office recruitment of professional staff from Spanish Speaking American community. • Bilingual/bicultural staff recruitment by State ESs and manpower programs

ACTION	NEXT STEPS
	• Calling on special purpose Spanish-Speaking organizations to assist in — training existing service delivery staffs. -- designing special services for the Spanish-speaking. • Giving prominence to Spanish-speaking Americans in CAMPS plans • Spanish-speaking American representation in CAMPS and program advisory boards. • Priority recruitment of Spanish-speaking outreach staffs • Bilingual/bicultural program component approaches. • Bilingual forums and written communications to Spanish-speaking American community.
	3. Regional plans reviewed and approved
	4. Local implementation is provided for under Strategic Manpower Planning.

CHAPTER IV

MANPOWER PLANNING FOR COMMUNITIES

Introduction

The Administration has expressed its intention in recent legislative proposals to decentralize the planning of manpower programs to State and local governments. Numerous steps are already underway within the scope of existing legislation to decentralize and strengthen community level planning under the direction of Mayors and Governors. A coordinated network of manpower programs at the point of impact on the individual recipient potentially represents a major step forward from the present fragmented and chaotic "non-system" of services. It should not be assumed, however, that changes underway or contemplated will automatically lead to more and better services to the disadvantaged generally or to the Spanish-speaking in particular. In fact, in the light of the situation in many communities, a likely outcome could be no substantial change, or even some backsliding, for Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and others. This will be the case unless the responsibilities of the community planning authority for involving the Spanish-speaking target group are spelled out; the steps to influence the allocation of resources to more responsive programs clearly identified; and the necessary guidance and assistance provided to ensure that the job is done right. The purpose of this chapter is to outline the elements of a successful approach to manpower planning. In the event the Administration elects not to further decentralize manpower programs, many of the planning approaches proposed herein could be applied, with appropriate modifications, to current planning strategies.

Assessment of Current Planning

On the basis of site visits to 20 communities and a review of planning procedures at regional and national levels, it is clear that, at present, there is no systematic effort to target manpower planning on the needs of Spanish-speaking Americans. In part, this is a reflection of the relatively primitive state-of-the-art of manpower planning for all recipients. More seriously, it indicates a lack of awareness of the disadvantaged status of the Spanish-speaking, an apparent absence of a priority commitment to correct that situation, and a dearth of knowledge of how to design and carry out responsive programs.

CAMPS (Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System) is the principal focus of what planning takes place. The nearly universal assessment of those persons contacted in the field -- including Mayor's Manpower Coordinators, ES, CAMPS Secretariats, program administrators, and the Spanish-speaking themselves - was that CAMPS is almost totally ineffective. The reasons given varied somewhat from place to place, but generally conformed to the following pattern:

- CAMPS lacks authority to make policy or funding decisions.
- Neither DOL nor ES adheres to the CAMPS plan in making funding decisions and carrying out priorities.
- Plans are developed late and are frequently completed after the real resource allocation decisions are made.
- Coordinating organizational responsibility and staff support tends to be weak.
- Programs and agencies represented on CAMPS are in competition for funding and providing services to the same clients.
- Local and state agencies "end-run" CAMPS successfully in dealing with their funding sources, reflecting a lack of coordination and follow through between and within Federal agencies.

- After funding, programs are administered separately and are not held accountable for performance in the light of a community-wide plan.
- Spanish-speaking community groups and target recipients are not involved in planning.
- Those agencies that have the primary planning responsibility rarely have Spanish-speaking staff members in key positions to influence decision-making.
- The typical "plan" is an amalgam of ES labor market figures and program client statistics, and, in many cases, is not a plan at all in the usual sense of an in-depth analysis that could be used for setting priorities, allocating resources, designing programs, and evaluating results.
- Only rarely are meaningful data provided in the plans on Spanish-speaking Americans, and, when included, data tend to be fragmentary demographic information that is unrelated to the program design and virtually useless for decision-making.

One area stood out as having moved further toward carrying out meaningful manpower planning -- Puerto Rico. In part, programs there were more effectively designed to meet the needs of the target population because Puerto Ricans themselves have responsibility for these activities and combine a high level of technical expertise with a shared language and cultural background with the disadvantaged. Furthermore, considerable emphasis has been given to social planning in related areas such as education and poverty for a number of years. Patterns of agency coordination are fairly well established. Data on program participation is better and more readily available than in other sites. In-depth evaluations of program results in Puerto Rico, as elsewhere, are not available, but it would appear that many program models could be found based on the planning taking place.

Other areas were taking beginning steps to bring responsibility for coordinating manpower planning under the Mayor's Office. In a few sites - San Antonio, San Diego, and San Jose - there was active interest in developing manpower plans that would include a priority emphasis on services to Chicanos. San Jose had hired a Chicano as Manpower Coordinator who has the confidence of Spanish-speaking groups in the community. Even in those places, however, no steps had been taken to evolve the necessary strategy and planning system. Officials everywhere were frank to concede that extensive technical assistance was necessary in how to carry out manpower planning as well as in providing the more specific focus on the Spanish-speaking population.

Efforts Underway to Strengthen Planning

DOL in recent months has initiated several activities in the planning area that should lead to general improvement, although there is no basis for assuring that this will add up to program benefits for Spanish-speaking Americans.

These changes fall in two areas: 1) modification of the structure and role of CAMPS to enable State and local government manpower planners to assume greater responsibilities; and 2) adoption of the Operational Planning and Control System (OPCS) which introduces a comprehensive planning-management system for Manpower Administration Regional Offices with new guidelines for review and approval of community and project planning efforts.

The basic changes in the CAMPS structure are as follows:

- CAMPS bodies are to be referred to as State Manpower Planning Councils (SMPC) at that level or Manpower Area Planning Councils (MAPC) at the local level.
- Manpower Planning Councils have the basic task of assisting Mayors and Governors to develop comprehensive manpower plans encompassing all manpower and related activities regardless of funding sources.
- MAPC and SMPC are conceived of as essentially advisory bodies to local and state chief executives on the interrelationships of manpower activities rather than having responsibility for program operations.
- MAPC and SMPC have an expanded mandate for overall review and evaluation of manpower programs in support of Federal operational review activities.
- The Regional Manpower Coordinating Committee and National Manpower Coordinating Committee continue as the chief policy advisory bodies at these levels.

The Regional Operational Planning and Control System (OPCS) is seen as a way to complement and tighten some loopholes in the new State and local planning arrangements. OPCS is designed to delegate to Regional Manpower Administrators (RMAs) broader discretion in funding and to encourage them to take into account priorities established by State and local government.

The main changes brought about by OPCS are as follows:

- Except for programs where State-by-State apportionment is required by law, decisions on State or city allocations will be delegated to RMAs.
- OPCS-72 regional multi-year planning documents will take the place of State CAMPS plans, Plans of Service, State agency budget requests, and sponsor plans and proposals as a basis for national decisions on resource allocations.
- Extent of need for manpower services will be based largely on the Annual Manpower Planning Report (AMPR) prepared by ES.
- Funding assumptions are based on F71971 program levels plus or minus 10 percent.
- In major modifications of resources within the region, the RMA is advised to take into account recommendations of CAMPS planning councils and Regional Councils.
- RMAs are expected to place available funds in areas where "greatest need exists" and in the hands of "program operators who can produce the best results".

> "State agencies whose performance is good may be given increased resources and States with poor performance may be reduced".

These changes in the CAMPS and regional arrangements are viewed as interim steps in the progression toward a single prime sponsorship arrangement under the control of the Mayor or other chief governmental executive toward which DOL is moving. This framework is intended to be the basis for implementation of full decentralization and revenue sharing.

The encouraging aspect of these new arrangements is that they may stimulate a few of the more able mayors to assume some leadership in the manpower field. There are scattered signs that this is starting to occur. DOL has made grants to a few localities to stimulate these developments. On the down side, it perpetuates the current situation in which no one really has authority and responsibility for the local manpower program; "plans" have no necessary influence over the allocation of resources; fragmentation of program services is allowed to continue; and no framework of accountability is established based on benefits for program recipients.

There is no basis for assuming that the new arrangements will lead to better services to the Spanish-speaking or other disadvantaged persons. In fact, the OPCS-72 planning forms perpetuate the weaknesses of CAMPS, AMPR and other report formats that either fail totally to identify the Spanish-speaking target groups or do so in a way that is useless for decision-making purposes.

Towards a Framework for Strategic Manpower Planning

What is called for is a fresh approach to strategic manpower planning to serve the disadvantaged, highlighting the special needs of Spanish-speaking Americans. Such an approach is outlined below. We believe that substantial progress can be made in implementing these recommendations under existing legislation. While this framework is in every respect consistent with the Administration's "game plan" for decentralization and revenue sharing, it would also bring about major improvements under a system of categorical grants.

The following approach was developed in discussion with CAMPS secretariats, Mayor's CAMPS Coordinators, program operators, State ES Agency personnel and Regional Office representatives. As the scheme was developed it was presented to respondents for criticism and refinement. There were no dissenters on the major concepts; there were alternatives suggested in connection with a few of the operating details.

1. Assumptions underlying this approach to strategic planning are:
   - a single prime sponsor of local* manpower projects (most likely the Mayor or other chief elected official of the local government)
   - manpower funds decategorized and pooled
   - DOL Regional Office funding decisions based on a review of the local plan

---

* It is assumed that the State would have primary responsibility in those areas where low population concentration, reluctance of local government to take over or other factors made that the only feasible arrangement. Similar arrangements should apply to State-run programs.

- Clear performance standards developed for programs serving the disadvantaged.
- Parity guidelines and priority in allocating resources to the Spanish-speaking in moving toward parity.
- Accountability, with future plans and funding based on monitoring of performance
- Adequate technical assistance provided

2. The framework includes a reconstituted Manpower Area Planning Council (MAPC), a Local Manpower Administration (LMA), and the Regional Office of the DOL Manpower Administration. The primary role of the MAPC would be to carry out the following subject to approval by the Mayor or other prime sponsor:

    - Approve the area manpower plan and submit it to DOL
    - Survey the employment opportunities and employability needs of the local labor market
    - Allocate resources to the employable workforce, the unemployable workforce, and within the various disadvantaged and minority communities
    - Identify manpower project options and estimate their costs
    - Select from among project options
    - Develop project priorities and specifications for the LMA
    - Identify the basic assumptions affecting potential success of the projects and specify performance measures

- Review LMA operational plans or subcontract arrangements for implementing projects
- Recommend projects for approval
- Review operating projects for strategic feasibility in light of changing conditions
- Defund projects where warranted by changing conditions for non-performance

The primary role of the Local Manpower Administration is to:

- Serve as the staff arm of the Mayor and the MAPC
- Do implementation planning of projects approved by MAPC
- Prepare RFPs for local or State agencies who wish to bid on projects or parts of projects
- Submit detailed implementation plans and proposed contracts to MAPC
- Project direction, administration and coordination
- Monitor and review subcontractor activities

The role of the DOL Manpower Administration under this scheme is to:

- Promulgate and enforce conditions of funding prime sponsors
- Provide or arrange for technical assistance to prime sponsors
- Evaluate prime sponsor operations and award incentive grants for high performance or impose funding sanctions for poor results

3. The MAPC would have the following specific duties and responsibilities:

   a. Conducting surveys of projected employment opportunities, economic development potential of the labor market area, and needs of the unemployed workforce.

   - Projected employment opportunities should be specified, to the degree possible, in terms of precise job specifications, number and kinds of hires anticipated by specific employers, starting wages, career opportunity and the schedule on which opportunities are expected to materialize.

   - Economic development potential of the labor market area should be specified in terms of kinds of industries which are expected to find the area attractive, the array of skills required by those industries, the specific companies whose interest in locating in the area is anticipated, the job specifications for various skills demanded by those companies, and as discussions are held with them, the probabilities that each will decide to locate in the area.

   - Needs of the unemployed workforce should be specified in terms of marketable skills, work history, vocational interests, age, sex, family status, racial-ethnic background, fluency in English, education status, area of residence, incidence of drug or alcohol addiction.

b. Resource allocation decisions, within guidelines promulgated by the Manpower Administration, need to reflect:

- proportion of funds allocated to the disadvantaged, and the proportion allocated to "labor exchange" and other operations
- Proportion of funds allocated to each of the racial-ethnic minorities among the target population
- Of the funds allocated to training of the disadvantaged, what proportion is allocated to the primary goal of permanent placement of trainees, and what proportion to the primary goal of experimenting with methods and techniques of better serving the severely disadvantaged.

c. Identifying project options - a project under consideration by the MAPC should be considered in the light of its feasibility in terms of a strategy of enrollee job groupings, outlined as follows:

- Precise job specifications - a group of job opportunities which have, in essence, the same specifications
- Precise characteristics of a group of the unemployed considered a good match with the job opportunities (given surveyed interests and capabilities)
- The number of opportunities available in this grouping based on projected needs of employers and a related number of potential trainees

- The kinds and amounts of services needed by the target group to qualify for the identified job opportunities.

d. Estimated project costs. The MAPC would need to estimate the fixed costs of the overall manpower effort and the variable costs of optional projects to aid in selection of projects.

e. Selection of projects, assuming that the opportunities to train and place people exceed the resources available to do so. The MAPC would need to

- Study overall community problems and needs (e.g., crime, delinquency, unemployment, etc.)
- Assess the impact of serving alternative groups of residents.
- Select projects to be implemented with available resources.

f. Development of key project specifications, including:

- The employment opportunity grouping, specifying names of employers where possible.
- Target resident grouping specifying precise employability needs and anticipated service needs
- The number of people to be served
- The estimated cost of the project

g. Identification of the basic assumptions affecting the feasibility of the project, e.g.,

- That a particular employer or industry will locate in the labor market area
- That an agreement can be negotiated with a particular union.

h. Review LMA plans for implementing projects, including assessment of:

- The relevance and comprehensiveness of services
- Thoroughness of delegation planning, including contractor statements of work
- Feasibility of the organizational structure
- Relation between goals and standards of performance
- Capability of proposed contractors
- Credility of proposed contractors with the target community
- Adequate arrangements for involvement of groups that understand special target group needs, particularly Spanish-speaking Americans.

i. Recommending projects for approval of the local prime sponsor.

j. Monitoring of ongoing projects.

k. Recommending the defunding of ongoing projects and substitution of new ones when warranted by changing conditions or other reasons for nonperformance.

4. The MAPC should be composed of

   a. Representatives of the target population selected by a process acceptable to them - guidelines should provide for broad representation of all major target groups including youth, women, the elderly and disabled; special care should be taken in insuring adequate involvement of all racial-ethnic groups generally proportionate to their share of the disadvantaged population.

   b. Representatives of industry, preferably including those industries offering the majority of job opportunities.

   c. Representatives of organized labor.

   d. Representatives of State and local agencies providing manpower services*

   e. Agencies providing related services**.

---

* Safeguards should be provided for balanced representation and voting power of manpower agencies so that they are not able, as at present, to dictate planning in the light of a narrow perception of their organizational self-interest rather than the needs of the community.

** The scope of activities of the MAPC should extend to the full range of services usually referred to as "Human Resources" development. Either through board representation, participation on board sub-committees or special task forces or by means of program coordination linkages, other community agencies should be involved to develop a manpower strategy within a larger strategy encompassing:

- education
- housing
- Model Cities and Community Action Agencies (and similar multi-service programs)
- community health and social services
- public transportation
- economic development

5. Technical Assistance to MAPC and LMA.

The following types of training and technical assistance should be provided MAPCs and LMAs as a condition of funding:

- Survey techniques to identify target group needs in a manner suited to program planning in the light of the concept of enrollee-job grouping.
- Defining the goals and objectives of manpower programs and relating those to planning, development, performance measurement and evaluation.
- Techniques for identifying project options and setting priorities.
- Methods of identifying causes and effects of community problems.
- Performance contracting procedures
- Information systems and reporting procedures
- Financial management.
- Designing programs to meet the needs of special target groups, particularly the Spanish-speaking.
- Involvement of Spanish-speaking community groups in manpower planning and operations.

6. DOL would perform the following functions:

- Promulgation of funding guidelines which include allocation of resources to the following major groups:
  - the employable workforce
  - the near employable disadvantaged

  - the severely disadvantaged unemployed
  - the various minorities, based on parity, in relation to their proportion of the target population

- Assisting in the development of Affirmative Action Plans for the Local Manpower Administration and all participating agencies, including quotas, time frames and specific education and training plans, all tailored to the populations to be served and the development needs of the minorities to be included among the staff (including clear goals and performance standards)
- Establishment and selected funding of MAPCs and LMAs with authority and responsibility as outlined above
- Contracts and subcontracts with participating agencies in the light of the local comprehensive manpower plan.
- Development of guidelines and assistance to the local community in formulating plans
- Technical assistance should be provided or arranged for by DOL to meet MAPC/LMA needs identified above, and in such areas as:
  - understanding and using the recommended planning process
  - obtaining the cooperation of other Federal agencies
  - making sense of operating results and findings ways to improve performance

- DOL should, prior to funding a prime sponsor, certify the logic underlying the overall plan and all of its parts (e.g., that all projects fall within the purposes of the overall plan, that project and interim goals add up to overall goals; that if all performance standards are met, the goals will be met; that the numbers and qualifications of staff are adequate to the tasks specified in job descriptions, etc.)

- RMAs should evaluate project performance against plans, and ensure broad distribution of the published results of evaluations.

- Programs which achieve outstanding results should be authorized additional funds, and other incentives should be provided to design and manage the overall local program for results.

Data and Information Needed for Manpower Planning

The above section outlines the essential elements of a strategic manpower planning system at the community level and indicates the steps DOL would need to take to put this in place and make it function to benefit Spanish-speaking Americans and other disadvantaged groups. Parallel steps have to be taken if the data and information necessary to carry out successful planning are to be made available. At present, data is not readily available at the Federal, State and local level to highlight needs of Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and others, nor to identify recipients of services. Still less is it possible to obtain in-depth results-oriented analyses of benefits to the target group resulting from participation in manpower activities.

The Action Plan gives high priority to the issue of obtaining relevant data for our report and to developing recommendations for making such data routinely available on an on-going basis. We are much indebted to the staff of the Manpower Administration, Office of

Manpower Management Data Systems, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Bureau of the Census for their assistance.

What is basically called for is a reorientation in traditional thinking that divides the population into demographic groups (to oversimplify) of Negro and white census data and manpower statistics are routinely reported in this way. Data on Spanish-speaking Americans are generally included under the white* category.

This has two effects - both disabling for meaningful manpower planning, evaluation and policy formation. First, it makes it impossible to cross-tabulate any of the enrollee characteristics or program performance data for persons of Spanish origin (even in those cases where a one-line data item tells how many Spanish-speaking there are in the total). Second, it distorts the data for whites since the Spanish-speaking sub-group tends to be more severely disadvantaged, have lower incomes, larger families, less education, higher unemployment rates, and are subjected to racial discrimination.

One may speculate that it has a third significant result - overstating the economic gains of Negroes relative to whites in recent years. If one can assume (as many observers believe the 1970 census will bear out) that Negroes have advanced in income and economic status relatively faster than Spanish-speaking Americans over the past decade, then the inclusion of the latter group with data for Anglos to that extent exaggerates the progress of Blacks in moving into the mainstream of American society.

---

* This varies considerably by geographic area and ethnic subgroup. It is estimated for example, that in New York City, one in four Puerto Ricans is counted as nonwhite.

What the customary ways of keeping manpower statistics fail to take into account is that, for any meaningful planning and policy-making purposes, the characteristics of Spanish-speaking Americans resemble those of other disadvantaged minorities, albeit with significant language and cultural differences. They would appear to have few common characteristics with Anglos, notwithstanding skin pigmentation. Yet, DOL, in the Manpower Report of the President and other key official documents, uses a definition of "minority" in which 92 percent are Negroes. Inclusion of the Spanish-speaking in the minority count would mean that one out of three minority target groups members would be either Chicano, Puerto Rican or other person of Spanish origin. Six out of ten minority members would be Negroes. Since many manpower and manpower related programs provide for priority in the delivery of services to minorities, these data practices directly contribute to actions by program administrators that leave out Spanish-speaking participants.

What is called for is a comprehensive interagency effort to modify data and informational practices as they affect the Spanish-speaking. The following outlines certain steps DOL can initiate immediately to this end:

- Recommend that the President appoint an Interagency Task Force charged with responsibility, in cooperation with the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for Spanish-Speaking Americans, for developing a comprehensive plan to produce meaningful economic and social data for use by Federal, State and local agencies in planning and developing programs for Spanish-speaking Americans.

- Together with Census, restratify the Current Population Survey (CPS) to include a statistically reliable national sample of Spanish-speaking persons.

- Modify reporting requirements for periodic unemployment and other manpower reports based on CPS to include the same in-depth analysis for the Spanish-speaking as is carried out now for other racial-ethnic groups. This should permit comparisons of Anglo-white, Negro, and Spanish-speaking American groups.

- Develop guidelines so that all BLS special studies and other DOL research and evaluation reports are prepared along the same lines. Where the office or contractor lacks staff with experience in dealing with Spanish-speaking data, direct that competent professional advisors with such experience be involved.

- Reporting guidelines and routine data displays for all existing manpower programs (e.g., MDTA, OJT, JOBS, WIN, NYC, CEP, Job Corps, PSC) should conform to the above on a national basis.

- Modify ESARS reporting guidelines and data summaries to conform to the above both for recording total participants and disadvantaged participants. As an interim step, this could be done only for a sample number of states of high target group concentration (see list of States in Chapter I).

- A special DOL/DHEW task force could be established to develop detailed data and information plans and procedures for the Family Assistance Plan and Opportunity for Families program.

- DOL guidelines should be developed on an agency-wide basis to standardize entry level forms for all manpower programs to provide for uniform reporting on the Spanish-speaking. The forms should be designed to permit:
  - comparisons of Spanish-speaking Americans with Anglo-whites and Negroes
  - ready cross-tabulation of enrollee characteristics and program participation and results
  - routinely identifying Spanish-speaking American subgroups as Mexican American, Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking*, with flexible options for state and local agencies to identify sub-groups within other category

---

* While it would be desirable to have national data available at a greater level of detail (e.g., including Cubans, Central and South Americans, Spanish-speaking Indians), the cost and complexity of such a system is believed to exceed its current utility.

  - enrollee self-identification rather than interviewer determination of racial-ethnic category

- DOL should sponsor research into state and local legislation that discourages racial-ethnic identification to determine the distorting effect it is having on obtaining accurate data. A program to seek changes in such legislation should be mounted in cooperation with ES, the National Civil Service League, and other interested groups.